THEOLOGY

A MONTHLY JOURNAL OF HISTORIC CHRISTIANITY

EDITED BY E. G. SELWYN, M.A.

Vol. VI. JANUARY, 1923 No. 31.

CONTENTS

Property of
CBDP
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

EDITORIAL

Some Recent Books.

ARTICLES

FURTHER ANGLO-CATHOLIC CONGRESS PAPERS.

The Holy Spirit in the Church (Manchester) - J. K. Mozley, B.D.
The Person of Christ (Norwich) - - - Prof. A. Nairne, D.D.
Jesus our Redeemer (Plymouth) - - - Bishop of Monmouth
The Kingdom of God in the Soul (Newcastle) - T. J. Hardy
The Holy Spirit in the English Church (Manchester and Plymouth) - - - S. L. Ollard
Our Responsibilities to the Nation (Norwich) - C. E. Osborne

MISCELLANEA

Studies in Texts - - - - - - - - W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D.

LONDON — Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.
TORONTO: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA, LTD.

2s. per copy; 12s. a year post free. U.S.A. and Canada, 30c. $3.60 a year post free.

V.6-7
1923

THEOLOGY

EDITED BY E. G. SELWYN, M.A.

MONTHLY, **1s.** *SUBSCRIPTION*, **12s.** *per annum.* VOL. I. JULY—DEC., 1920. VOL. II. JAN.—JUNE, 1921. VOL. III. JULY—DEC., 1921. VOL. IV. JAN.—JUNE, 1922. VOL. V. JULY—DEC., 1922. Each 10s.

Cases may be had from S.P.C.K. at 1/6 each. Back numbers can be obtained at 1s. each, postage extra.

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS:

1921.		
December.	The Idea of the Eucharist	A. E. Baker.
	New Movement in the Lutheran Church	L. Patterson.
	Communion in One Kind	W. J. Sparrow Simpson.
1922.		
January.	The Idea of the Eucharist (*continued*)	A. E. Baker.
February.	The Acts of the Apostles in Recent Criticism (*continued in June*)	W. K. Lowther Clarke.
	Two Figures in French Religion	G. C. Rawlinson.
	Ideals and Achievements at the Old Vic	Miss Lilian Baylis.
March.	The Temptation in the Wilderness—A Possible Interpretation	Sister Agnes Mason.
	On Development and its Limitations	Prof. C. H. Turner, D.Litt.
	The Group Mind of the Church	C. E. Scott Moncrieff, D.D.
April.	Organs of Religious Authority	R. H. Thouless.
	The Use of Cathedrals	W. H. Hutton, D.D.
	The New Testament Text	Prof. Souter.
May.	Authority in Morals	R. H. Thouless.
	Credo in Carnis Resurrectionem	T. A. Lacey.
June.	The Urgency of Eucharistic Revision	E. C. Trenholme, S.S.J.E.
	The Dual Idea of the Sacraments	Dundas Harford.
	Science and Theology	E. O. James.
July.	Spiritualism	H. J. C. Matthews.
	History and Religion	Ernest Barker.
	Permanent Elements in Protestant Theology	C. J. Shebbeare.
August.	A Study of John Bunyan	E. G. Selwyn.
	Maintenance of the Clergy in the Early Church	C. P. S. Clarke.
	The Martyrdom of St. John	W. Lockton.
September / *October*	*Out of print.*	
November.	Catholicism in Germany	E. C. Hoskyns.
	Barlow Once More.	Canon T. A. Lacey.
December.	The Early Chapters of Genesis	N. G. Lawson.
	St. Stephen's Place in Christian Origins	E. G. Selwyn.

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. VI JANUARY, 1923 No. 31

EDITORIAL

SOME RECENT BOOKS

The contrast between the Dean of St. Paul's and Professor Unamuno of Salamanca is not unlike that between the two great African Fathers, Origen and Tertullian. The Dean confesses himself a disciple of Plato, and his second series of *Outspoken Essays** proves more clearly, perhaps, than any of his earlier writings his title to the claim. For him, as for Origen, Platonism appears to provide the best medium for the expression of the Christian verities and values in the terms of modern reason. And the Dean's Spanish contemporary† is as candidly the spiritual descendant of Tertullian. He wants to recover the audacity of the *credo quia absurdum*. Reason, he says, "succeeds in plunging itself into the depths of scepticism," from which abyss only the vital longings of the heart, and especially the longing for immortality, can extricate us. Faith is thus suprarational, even contrarational; but it is a necessity for life, and this necessity gives the measure of its truth. And both these writers, let us add, are men of immensely wide and deep learning. Unamuno seems at home in the whole literature of the world, both ancient and modern, and quotes from it with amazing aptness; while Dr. Inge's learning is, of course, a byword.

"The tragic history of human thought," says Unamuno, "is simple—the history of a struggle between reason and life—reason bent on rationalizing life and forcing it to submit to the inevitable, to mortality; life bent on vitalizing reason and forcing it to serve as a support for its own vital desires"

* Longmans. 1922.

† *The Tragic Sense of Life.* Macmillan, 1921. 17s. net.

337939

(p. 115). That is the central thesis of the book. All the intellectual constructions woven by reason in its effort to understand the world and society and God are but cages which this vital faith must break through, if life is not to be smothered. And so we need a God who is far more than we can comprehend.

> Not because he thinks can God be God, but because He works, because He creates; He is not a contemplative but an active God. A God-Reason, a theoretical or contemplative God, such as is this God of theological rationalism, is a God that is diluted in His own contemplation. With this God corresponds, as we shall see, the beatific vision, understood as the supreme expression of human felicity. A quietist God, in short, as reason, by its very essence, is quietist (p. 164).

Accordingly " there may even be a truer revelation in superstition itself than in theology. The venerable father of the long beard and white locks, who appears among the clouds carrying the globe of the world in his hand, is more living and more real than the *ens realissimum* of theodicy " (p. 178).

The villain of Unamuno's piece is Goethe; the hero Don Quixote. Or is the true hero our Lord Jesus Christ ? The fact that one can ask the question indicates the baffling paradoxes of the book. For Unamuno is a Christian in heart, Catholic, but non-Thomist. Only a Catholic could have written the chapter entitled Love, Suffering, Pity, or that other called Faith, Hope, and Charity. Here is his personal faith, which recalls St. Paul, Pascal, Newman:

> I believe in God as I believe in my friends, because I feel the breath of His affection, feel His invisible and intangible hand, drawing me, leading me, grasping me; because I possess an inner consciousness of a particular providence and of a universal mind that marks out for me the course of my own destiny. And the concept of law—it is nothing but a concept after all !—tells me nothing and teaches me nothing.
>
> Once and again in my life I have seen myself suspended in a trance over the abyss; once and again I found myself at the cross-roads, confronted by a choice of ways and aware that in choosing one I should be renouncing all the others—for there is no turning back upon these roads of life; and once and again in such unique moments as these I have felt the impulse of a mighty power, conscious, sovereign, and loving. And then, before the feet of the wayfarer, opens out the way of the Lord (pp. 194, 195).

Chapter X., entitled The Mythology of the Beyond, rivals the *Parmenides* of Plato in its swift interplay of question and answer. Every defence of Immortality and every criticism of it is to be found here. And Unamuno sees the charge that he is open to: " Who is this that speaketh words without wisdom, that darkeneth counsel ?" He replies that " Conduct, practice, is the proof of doctrine, theory " (p. 262); quotes

Pascal's saying: "Begin by taking holy water, and you will end by becoming a believer"; and thus formulates the "moral proof" of Immortality:

> Act so that in your own judgment and in the judgment of others you may merit eternity, act so that you may become irreplaceable, act so that you may not merit death. Or perhaps thus: Act as if you were to die to-morrow, but to die in order to survive and be eternalized (p. 263).

So Aristotle, working from very different premises, closes the *Ethics* with like advice—that we should not "think only human things because we are men, nor mortal things because we are mortal, but, so far as in us lies, play the Immortal and do everything with a view to living on the level of the highest that is in us."* Noble counsel, whether it come from reason or from faith; and because each gives it, perhaps we may surmise that their roots lie not far apart.

The second series of the Dean's *Outspoken Essays* contains his celebrated Romanes lecture on *The Idea of Progress* and Bede lecture on *The Victorian Age*, which readers will be glad to have together; two sociological articles already published in quarterlies; the five Hibbert lectures of 1920 on *The State, Visible and Invisible;* and an opening contribution called *Confessio Fidei*, setting forth the quintessence of Dr. Inge's theology. In printing this immediately before the Hibbert lectures, the Dean is following the precedent of Plato, who passes from the exposition of the Ideas in the central books of the *Republic* to a criticism of the different forms of polity which had appeared in the history of Greece. It is mainly with the *Confessio Fidei* that we shall here deal.

Dr. Inge's theology derives a special strength from the fact that he has a very thorough knowledge of the conclusions of Natural Science and a great belief in its methods; and he uses this knowledge with marked effect. It is worth putting on record that—

> modern science, in the mouths of some of its most distinguished representatives, has been unable to avoid the conclusion, based on the second law of thermo-dynamics, that the whole universe is slowly running down like a clock. . . . Its supporters have not always drawn the obvious inference that if the universe is running down in time, it must have been wound up in time, and that whatever unknown power wound it up once may presumably be able to wind it up again (p. 18).

On the whole the Dean inclines to the belief that "the world is perpetual, as its Creator is eternal," the process of

* Eth. Nicom. X. vii. 8.

" running-down " apparent in one part of the universe being compensated for by a process of " winding-up " in other parts. Yet an equally fair inference from scientific conclusions would seem to be that the Christian doctrines of Creation and of the End of the World are not rendered improbable by modern science.

But Dr. Inge leaves nothing to be desired in his assertion of the Divine transcendence:

> The universe (he says) . . . is not essential to the being of God, but is a continuous act congruous to His nature. There is no single purpose being realized in it, for the time series has no first and last term, between which a single all-embracing purpose could be inaugurated and consummated. But there is a vast number of limited purposes, which have their beginning and end in time. The achievement of these purposes adds nothing to the being or the well-being of the Creator, nor does their failure involve Him in any loss. They are His thoughts, transmuted in the time series into purposes or acts of will, and their validity may be illustrated as well by the results of rebellion as by the results of obedience. In their entirety, they are the complete expression of the Divine mind, so far as it can be expressed in an imperfect medium (p. 19).

It is gratifying also to find a plain assertion of other Christian truths, such as the Incarnation and the Cross. The Dean would agree with Unamuno that " Tell me Thy name ! is essentially the same as Save my soul !" " Neither natural law (he says) nor the beauty of the world suffices to manifest or call forth the love which binds together man and his Creator. Nor would any display of almighty power for our sakes evoke it. So far as I can see, nothing but a personal Incarnation, and the self-sacrifice of the Incarnate, could either adequately reveal the love of God for man or call forth the love of man for God " (p. 46).

The place occupied in Plato's earlier theory by the Ideas is filled in Dr. Inge's philosophy by the Absolute Values—namely, Wisdom, Beauty, and Goodness. They are " spiritual goods, in which we may participate in proportion to our own spiritual growth. We do not make them; they are above us. It is rather they that make us immortal and blessed if we can lay hold of them and live in them " (p. 21). These values are attributes of God, revealed as such, partly in the world of nature, partly in the human soul (which is part of nature), but supremely in Jesus Christ. They correspond to what Catholic theologians speak of as Supernature; they are, to use von Hügel's term, " the transcendent become immanent to our

human world." And the question may fairly be asked whether this doctrine of values suffices to explain that mediation between God and man which is the central fact of Christianity.

We cannot give more than a personal answer. But for our own part we feel this theology of values to be deficient on one very important side. It does not seem to us to give adequate weight to the fact and experience of Grace. Certainly Dr. Inge safeguards himself very thoroughly against any charge of subjectivism in his conception of the Absolute Values; but are they not too impersonal for the rôle which he assigns to them? On the one hand, it seems quite possible to appreciate Wisdom and Beauty without any reference to religion: they may be and often are the objects of abstract sentiments which take the place of—rather than lead to—belief in God. They seem to need some touch or colouring, as from some other world, before they become religious. On the other hand, our communion with God appears to speak very plainly of relationship with a Living One, who gives, empowers, and enlightens. What we experience is Grace; and the highest values of life present themselves as χαρίσματα or grace-gifts of the Spirit. In other words, on the Godward side of the mediation between God and man we think of energy, movement, vital and dynamic activity. It is these—Spirit, Life, Grace—which make the values vivid and real, which awaken the soul to see them, and which enable us to participate in them. Probably the Dean would reply that this element is provided for in his insistence upon Love as the revealed content of Goodness.* Perhaps it is; perhaps it is only a question of proportion and emphasis; but, even so, the result is to make it doubtful whether Christian theology will ever find this doctrine of values adequate to express its experience and faith. It is significant that the two philosophers—the Englishman and the Spaniard—though they proceed by such devious paths, meet at the end in many of their conclusions. Thus, Unamuno says that "that which we call the world, the objective world, is a social tradition" (p. 146), and Dr. Inge that "the world of ordinary experience is not the world of science, but a very roughly constructed scheme of values, selected by the practical consciousness as bearing on our own psychological life and needs" (p. 20). So, too, the Dean echoes the "moral proof" of Unamuno, when he bids us "keep the vision of the City of God before our eyes, and try to realize the

* *E.g.*, p. 155: '[The love of God] pours itself into all beings as the divine impulse to rejoice in the perfection and beauty of every being, and blissfully to feel this unity of life.'

highest and most spiritual values in the life of our country" (p. 138). And each has complaints to bring against the way in which the Christianity of his own country makes impact on the civil order. Here is the Anglican, witnessing to the unseen world:

> Nevertheless, our citizenship is in heaven, our life here a pilgrimage. Secularized Christianity ignores or denies this; and it should by this time be plain that secularized Christianity has neither savour nor salt. "Otherworldliness" alone can transform this world, because the other world is the reality of which this world is the shadow (p. 32).

We seem to hear Nevile Figgis himself. But now let the Spanish Catholic tell the other side:

> There is scarcely a single servant of the State who feels the religious bearing of his official and public duties. Nothing could be more unsatisfactory, nothing more confused, than the feeling among our people with regard to their duties towards the State, and this sense of duty is still further obliterated by the attitude of the Catholic Church, whose action so far as the State is concerned is truly anarchical . . . but to imitate Christ is to take up each one his own cross, the cross of his own civil occupation—civil and not merely religious—as Christ took up His cross, the cross of His calling, and to embrace it and carry it, looking towards God and striving to make each act of this calling a true prayer (pp. 275, 277).

How paradoxically Catholicism and Protestantism thus supplement one another!

Two books on Modernism have reached us lately. Mr. A. C. Champneys entitles his criticism *A Different Gospel*,* and the title explains the aim of the book. There are some useful things in it, such as the criticism of Mr. Major's exegesis of Luke vi. 35. The weakness of the book lies in its attempt to cover too much ground—much of it ground where even experts tread very warily. Its strength lies in the fact that it approaches Modernism from a single standpoint—that of the Catholic Faith. Professor Faulkner's *Modernism and the Christian Faith*,† on the other hand, has the weakness without the strength of Mr. Champneys' book. Many of his arguments have, no doubt, something in them, taken in detail; but they are as much lacking in coherence as Modernism itself. It is as though two armies were meeting, each of them consisting of stragglers without any unity of command. It is impossible to say who wins, because no one can discover the decisive point of the battle. And when Professor Faulkner writes, "The

* G. Bell and Sons. 1922. 3s. 6d. net.
† George Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d. net.

ellipse God has two foci, divinity and humanity," we feel that the only thing to do is to leave the battle to look after itself.

Memorial Collects of Saints and Worthies, Ancient, Mediæval, Modern, whose names do not appear in the calendar of the Book of Common Prayer, arranged according to their days in order of the months, is an attempt to fill a gap often felt. Dr. Foakes Jackson drew attention to the need in an article in this Journal last spring, and we hope that this attempt to meet it will stimulate others. There is a certain paradox in finding the name of Martin Luther next that of St. Francis Xavier in the chronological list of those commemorated, or that of John Knox next St. Theresa's; and we may wonder whether (say) Tillotson should be commemorated at all. But no one can answer these questions before trial has been made. Several of the collects are good, but the form "as . . . So we may, etc. . . ." is far too common.

In *The Life of the Spirit and the Life of To-day*,* Miss Evelyn Underhill has added to her studies of Mysticism, with especial reference to the bearing of modern psychology on religious experience. The fact that the book passed into a second edition within a few months of publication shows how great is the interest in the subject. The book shows wide reading, and is well-stocked with quotations from the mystical writings of many faiths. But we confess to disappointment in one respect: we cannot see the wood for the trees. The chapter, for example, entitled *History and the Life of the Spirit* seemed to promise some analysis of what the connection between the two was—a point of great importance for those whose Creed is largely concerned with historical facts. But in point of fact almost any other title would do equally well. And it is surely vital, in any discussion of religious experience, to take seriously those great summaries of it which are to be found in Catholic dogma. Miss Underhill shows a rich capacity for appreciating many different forms of religion. We could wish that she gave us some criteria for distinguishing between them.

Mr. W. W. Cannon is known to many of our readers as the author of a charming study of *The Song of Songs*: and he has now again laid us under his debt by a similar study of the 68th Psalm.† In the Introduction he reviews the various attempts which have been made to determine the date of the Psalm, and urges that the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem

* Methuen. 1922.
† *The 68th Psalm.* Cambridge University Press. 1922. 8s. 6d. net.

under Nehemiah and the subsequent festal procession described in Nehemiah xii. 27-43 provides the occasion which inspired this poem. The mention of "the processions (plural) of God," for example, in v. 24 of the Psalm is due to the fact that Nehemiah marshalled "two praise-choirs" for this celebration. Mr. Cannon finds in the Psalm a number of quotations from older Hebrew literature, and these he puts in inverted commas in his translation of the Psalm. Readers of the translation will dwell with special interest upon v. 30, which is one of the curiosities of our Prayer Book. This is how Mr. Cannon renders it:

> Rebuke the wild beast of the reed, the company of bulls—lords of peoples; Let them come grovelling with bars of silver; Scatter the peoples that delight in wars.

The allusion is to Egypt, symbolized by the hippopotamus, whose designs against the great King augured danger for the Jews and for their peace; the bars of silver refer to the ingots such as were actually used later by Ochus instead of coinage for the payment of his mercenaries; and "the peoples that delight in wars" are those states like Athens and Sparta, whose soldiers and sailors of fortune were at the disposal of any warlike ambitions.

No doubt the last word on this book must come from the Hebraists; but meanwhile we must congratulate Mr. Cannon on a lucid and scholarly piece of work. There is not a dull page in it.

Professor Burkitt has conceived the idea of turning a good part of Ecclesiastes into English verse* of the metre of Omar Khayyám. It is excellent reading. The preacher's "vanity" he renders by the word "bubble"—a point which he justifies in the Preface. To the illustrations of the Hebrew original which he there gives we venture to add another. The writer of these notes was travelling from Plymouth to Exeter and listening to the talk of three countrymen of Devon in the intervals of reading Professor Burkitt's book. Mr. Lloyd George became the topic of talk, and one countryman exclaimed: "Lloyd George! . . . I don't trust 'ee no more than the smoke what comes from a cigarette." But we have written enough.

* S.P.C.K., 6d. net and 1s. 6d. net, 1922.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH

In the Apostles' Creed we say "I believe in the Holy Ghost,' and immediately follow on with "the holy Catholic Church." This close association of the Church with the Spirit is very significant. We come to the end of the statement of our faith in the Divine Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and continue, not with the recitation of any particular blessings which God bestows upon the Christian soul, but by proclaiming the existence, the sacredness, and the greatness of the social and corporate side of Christianity. We speak of it not as an ideal towards which we pass, but as a reality here with us in the world. We speak of it, and of the Communion of Saints, which has so much to do with it, as the society in which the blessings are to be found which become the blessings of each individual Christian, one by one. Forgiveness, resurrection, eternal life—these are blessings which each Christian soul may enjoy, not indeed apart from other souls, and yet in a quite real and necessary sense, each for itself and as itself. My soul is my soul, and never, to all eternity, will it be your soul. But before the Creed says anything which brings in the thought of individual blessings, it speaks of that society of Christian souls, that home within which the Christian blessings are most surely to be found: it speaks of the Holy Catholic Church.

Now you may well say that I have been reading a good deal into this short article of the Creed. And yet all that I have been doing is to try to see what it means that the article of belief in the Church comes just where it does. The fact that before we pass from our faith in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost to our faith in blessings which are gifts from God to man, we stop to say that we believe in something which does not fall exactly into either group, is a remarkable fact, and we must try to understand and interpret it. For this position which the Creed assigns to the Church is one which to large numbers of Christians would not be at all a matter of course. That after we have given our witness to the richness of our belief in God by associating faith in the Holy Ghost with faith in the Father and the Son, we should immediately pass to the thought of the Church, there are many good Christians who, if they compare the Creed with their own private ideas, must find this very strange.

And yet so far is this emphasis upon the social and corporate aspect of religion from being something quite peculiar to Christianity or to one particular type of Christianity, that it is found

very early indeed in the history of religion. For in primitive religion the god of this or that tribe is likely to deal, whether in anger or in graciousness, not with individual members of the tribe, but with the tribe as a whole. The morality, such as it is, however thin its substance, is the morality of the tribe; an individual who acts against it may bring down the wrath of the god on the whole tribe, which is, as it were, responsible to the tribal god for the perservation of the tribal customs. And the extent to which this thought of the importance of a society obtained in Jewish religion is made plain enough in the Old Testament. Indeed, the outstanding problem of Old Testament religion was how to secure for the individual a due sense of his own religious value, responsibility, and destiny in view of the immense strength of the corporate idea.

The position, then, of the Church in the Creed is not one for which in older religion there has been no preparation. But can we find a special reason for the mention of the Church immediately after the mention of the Holy Ghost? Can we say that there is something specially fitting in the closeness to one another of these two articles of the Creed?

Well, think of that great chapter in which, for the first time in his letters, St. Paul admits us to his vision of the Catholic Church (1 Cor. xii.). In that chapter there is a grand double thought. The former part of the thought is that the Spirit is one, and at the same time manifests Himself in the different spiritual gifts—wisdom, powers of healing, prophecy, and so on—with which different Christians are endowed. The latter part of the thought is that the differences in faculties, powers, and functions which exist among Christians do not prevent Christians from being one body. The unity of the Holy Spirit faces outwards and becomes the source of all these manifold excellencies among Christians; but these excellencies are not the property of any individual, they belong to the one body, and face inwards to it. To the body each new Christian is joined; to its excellencies he adds whatever is the Spirit's gift to him. But, at the very outset of his Christian life, it is by the Spirit that he has been baptized into the body—a vitally important idea, as it is a fact, since it involves the closest connection between the Spirit and the body, so that the great gift of the Spirit, which stands at the beginning of the religious life, is the gift of unity with the body. If, later on, in writing to the Ephesians, St. Paul was to put in the forefront of the great Christian unities the one body and the one Spirit, that is all prepared for in the Corinthians' chapter. One cannot be wrong in saying that for him the reality of the one body which is the Church corresponds in a quite natural way, though (if I may be

allowed the expression) it is the naturalness of the supernatural, to the reality of the one Spirit.

Thus the unity of the Church, so far from being an accidental attribute of the Church, is one of the great marks or notes of the Church whereby the Church is to show that she is the body which the Spirit fills with His power, and to which He gives the helps and the graces of the many members. And I cannot allow that there is any perversion of unity into uniformity, if one says that, granted the idea of the unity of the Church, unity ought also to be present in such characteristic expressions of the Church's life as the Creed, the ministry, and the sacraments.

It is a magnificent vision to which we are admitted when we open our eyes to the vast richness and significance of our belief in the Church. For it is by this belief that we realize that Christian doctrine does not make its appeal to the intellect or even to the heart of Christians who stand aloof from one another, until they join together in a society of their own making; but we learn Christian doctrine in the Church. Here we learn to believe in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, in creation and redemption and sanctification, and in that new creation itself, the firstfruits and final glory of the precious blood shed on Calvary, the garden in which the soul is watered with the dew and warmed with the sunshine of God's heavenly grace, the home which is ever being enriched and beautified by the trophies which its children bring into it, above all by the memorials of themselves which they leave behind to the home, of the lives lived within it and inspired by its teaching, lives of enduring faith, of heroic adventure, of deepening holiness. Such is the Church, not that it is or can be here and now the whole fulness of the vision. For the Church grows into what it is God's purpose that the Church should become. You cannot understand or value the Church aright unless you take together these two facts—the Church is given, and the Church grows; it is God's free, gracious, Spirit-filled gift to us, and our penitent, striving, all-grateful response to God. It is not easy, you will say, to hold these two aspects together. No, but you must have both, that you may have all the inspiration which comes from the knowledge that you are of the Church, sharing in the wealth of the Church's life, drinking of the living waters which tell of the presence of the Spirit in the Church, and all the responsibility which is the child of the remembrance that the Church does really depend, in however small a degree, on your endeavours, your sacrifices, your capacities for suffering, your fresh springs of joy.

One of two evils may easily beset the life of the Christian :

formalism, convention, mechanical routine on the one hand; vagueness, disorder, waste on the other. Here you see a hard efficiency, limited in outlook and range, scarcely conscious of the great mountain peaks and the distant horizons—the type of mind for which the problem of religion is no more than the problem of a jig-saw puzzle: the pieces are all to hand, and the only business is that of fitting them into one another. And there you have an enthusiasm which bubbles up from the shallows of a mind and experience which know little of the great deeps of sin and of God's atoning goodness which has gone deeper still, which judges in terms of individual preferences and impulses, picks and chooses among ideas and purposes as though religion meant a lot of beliefs and practices, jumbled together incoherently like articles in a bran-pie at a bazaar, and each person must take what he finds most helpful, and feel no further responsibility than that. Of course, you will never find either type quite at its worst, but the existence of those two types at all shows the harm which results when belief in the Holy Spirit and belief in the Holy Church do not walk hand-in-hand. It is not simply a question of having the one and not the other; but the overlooking, neglect, practical abandonment of either belief reacts gravely upon the other. The Spirit and the Church possess a real and divine union. It is the Spirit and the Bride together which bid the Christian soul to come to the waters of life; and that real union, a union in which we see the hand of God Himself, is a union which must be real for us too.

There are three lines along which we may look in order to see the meaning of the dwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Church. First, the line of the Church's doctrine and theology. I think partly of those great dogmatic utterances which we have in the Creeds, partly of Christian theology as a continually living and growing science. I am sure that amid the anxious restlessness of so much of modern religious thought we ought to find a true rest for our minds in the assurance that the Holy Spirit does lead the Church forward into all truth. There are wonderful powers of growth and of recovery. There is an instinct for true proportion and balance. So long as the unity of the Church remains broken, the doctrinal tasks of the Church can be handled only sectionally, but we are indeed slow of imagination if the magnificence of the Christian view of God and the world, as something which really exists, and exists as a great temple of truth and not as a battered ruin, does not deeply move us. There is a Catholic Creed, a Creed which lives on, thank God, where the Catholic view of the ministry and Catholic sacramental practice, which seem to us

to go so naturally with the Creed, are of rather small account. I do not say that there are not questions of real difficulty with regard to Christian doctrine, with regard, for instance, to the view we ought to take of doctrinal decisions and doctrinal formularies which have not been the result of a deliberate concentration of the mind of the whole Church upon some debated question; and I would venture to say that it is not necessarily a proof of being a good Catholic to desire to extend the area of exact dogmatic decisions. But when I remember that there is a Christian view of God and the world; when I remember how that view, though in a true sense given in the New Testament, has yet been won for our use through controversies of a very difficult and very exacting character, controversies out of which it must sometimes seem as though nothing good could come; when, looking back from the higher ground to which the future has brought us, I can see how, again and again, in the disputes which to some seem so useless and barren concerning the Person and the Natures of our Lord, any other decision than that to which the Church came would have worked itself out into utterly disastrous consequences for the Christian Religion—then what can I do but affirm, and with profound joy, that the Church has in truth been guided by the Holy Ghost, and that the one doctrine concerning the mystery of life which seems to me to have the power to satisfy our minds and hearts represents no merely human achievement, but that through the voice of the Church can be heard the speech of the Holy Ghost ?

Then, secondly, along the line of what the Church teaches concerning right and wrong, and of all its wealth of holy lives, we pass to the conviction that it is only the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church which explains the special quality of Christian goodness. We may feel this, especially when we read of or converse with someone who has obviously penetrated far within the secret chambers of true saintliness. To me there comes a sense of the immense evidential value of the Christian life, both as an achievement which, in the heroes and saints of the Church, rises up and refuses to be denied, and as the ideal which challenges us all. That the saints really mean nothing at all, so far as the truth about life goes, is for me not only an utterly intolerable, but an utterly ridiculous thought. That as the saints have understood life and lived it, so essentially life is, that conclusion and that alone satisfies my reason. Wherever the flame of Christian holiness soars heavenwards and illuminates all around it with its pure and ardent light, there is the sign of the fire that has fallen from heaven, the fire of the Holy Ghost. Wherever there is true

goodness, there is the Spirit of God; but in certain kinds and manifestations of goodness His presence is, as it were, more visibly displayed. As in the case of the Church's doctrine, I do not mean that there are no perplexities. The holiness of the Church has been a flower which evil weeds within the Church have too often tried to strangle. And the zeal for holiness itself has not always been a zeal according to knowledge. But the more one sadly admits all this, the less is it possible to reduce to a naturalistic level the amazing reality of the holiness which has sprung up and thrived—and does so still—within the Church, thrived, not despite the Church and owing little to the Church, but with its roots deep sunk in the Church's soil, and nourished by all that the Church offers as nourishment for the members of the body. And what does this mean but that the Spirit who, within the Church, is the Spirit of truth is, also within the Church, the Spirit of holiness?

Finally, in the direct impact of the Church upon the world, both in the work of preaching the Gospel and in the testimony which the Church gives, as to the things which belong to and create the world's best life, we see the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. It is the Spirit who brings conviction to the world in respect of the fact and the deadliness of sin, the commanding claims of righteousness, and the reality of judgment. And for such action upon the world He uses not solely, yet in large measure, the Church. It is His presence, His inspiration, which kindles—and when the fire has sunk low rekindles—the Church to walk worthy of her vocation. Some of the grandest aspects of the Church's task have the appearance of an adventurous voyage into uncharted seas. Each new age, as it comes, presents the Church with new problems and new responsibilities. Good, then, is it to remember the Apostle's word—Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. The Church, in finding the true adjustment between herself and the movements and challenges of the age, has not to rely only on her mother-wit with the added wealth of her long experience. Not by might or power, not by worldly wisdom or craft of policy, is the contribution of the Church to the world to be made. The Church learns to serve the passing generations according to the will of God by the Spirit that dwells in her. For the life that she has is not given her for her private enjoyment, but that she may lead all men into the paths of peace and righteousness and of the knowledge of God. And nothing could more exalt in those who love her with the love of her own children the greatness and the wonder of the Church than the continual memory of what her vocation

is—the harvesting, through the Spirit, of the world, whose salvation drew the atoning blood from Christ, and Christ from God.

All great and creative movements have their weaknesses. For into every movement enters on its human side something of the shortsightedness, of the failure sufficiently to expand our vision and to make it inclusive of all that it ought to include, which each one of us knows as a shortcoming and failure in the individual life. And because these congresses are not meetings for mutual congratulations, but, in part at least, for the clearer realization of the power of the Gospel for a fuller conversion of our country, it is not, I hope, out of place to say that while the Catholic revival in the Church of England has done a work of inestimable importance in its recovery of faith in the Holy Catholic Church as one of the great articles of the Creed which lights up the meaning of Christianity and the promises and hopes of the Gospel, nevertheless, as it seems to me, the movement has not yet found itself, as it needs to find itself, does not speak with the power with which I would to God it did speak, in connection with the vast problems of social, industrial, and international life. That defect is to be remedied by deeper insight into the tremendous doctrine of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the Church. For it is, indeed, a tremendous doctrine raising questions which, if pursued far enough, bring within their scope that one problem so manifold, so subtle, and yet so urgent, so critical for the life of both Church and world—the problem of the relationship which should exist between the Church and the world. Easy solutions do not exist, but there can be no true solution at all, unless, first, we have learnt to bring together in the depth and breadth of our thoughts the Holy Catholic Church and the Holy Ghost who dwells within her as her life. And as we learn so shall we give, give what men would hold with joy in their hearts, could their hearts but be opened to the vision—to the vision of a Catholic society, seeing by the light and glowing with the fire of a perpetual Pentecost, with its Lord's word as its charter to the nations: I am amongst you as he that serveth; with its Lord's promise as its strength and stay: Ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you.

J. K. Mozley.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST

I.

ANYONE who goes to a Jewish synagogue will be moved by the prayers—passionate, thoughtful, serious, deeply engraven with the liturgic character. But he will find a sense of coldness, of abstraction, growing within him. He misses the familiar close, For the sake of Jesus Christ, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Our human Lord and Master, our brother man, the intimacy of kinship, loyalty, affection: our own worship is full of this. Having it, we scarcely notice how full. Leave it out, and we yearn for it.

What if there were no Gospels to read, no life of the Lord Jesus to think and dream about. There are a thousand cares, pleasures, businesses, which distract us, yet a far larger part of our everyday thought is taken up by that Gospel story than we are aware of. The gentleness and power of Jesus Christ; His wisdom and His words; His call to a morality so daring and austere that we cannot get it out of our minds and we are never quite easy in conscience; the promises of infinite reach in goodness peace happiness which He attaches to this renunciation, and we are always wishing that we could but make up our minds and enjoy that goodness peace happiness. Then the dying for His friends and the forgiving of His enemies. Then the history which flows from that heroic act and answers back to it; the romantic loyalty of apostles martyrs church. Here is an inherited nobility for us to conserve, purely and proudly; a Lord and Master to be faithful to; a friend also, touched with the feeling of our infirmities; an example which never fails in fitness as a criticism of life.

This is memory of one who lived on earth, a man among mortal men. In proportion as mortal men, our fathers masters children brothers friends have lived their little lives before us greatly purely self-forgettingly, so do we understand how true it is that memory is a mode of life, and while we really remember and love still burns, we do not doubt that they still live with us in the mansion of the Spirit in the Father's universal house. And supreme among—or is it more than among?—those waiting ones is our Lord Jesus, once of Nazareth. And one day He will be manifested, says His disciple, and we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is.

Sunt lacrimæ rerum et mentem mortalia tangunt: The sense of tears in mortal things and the consolation of the manhood of our Lord. Have you not noticed how the cult of the Name

revives in troubled times—when the first persecution arose, when England lay desolate from the Wars of the Roses, and now, to-day, when after war and sorrow every knee is bowing at the name of Jesus, and every heart is asking, Can we begin again and be happy in honest obedience to the Sermon on the Mount?

The Person of Christ: Ecce Homo is the first chapter, the simple Gospel which was once believed in Galilee.

II.

Who contemplates the course of history without recognizing that its coherence is not the play of mere phenomena? We may, indeed, play with epigrams or short views: history, the record of human folly or cruelty; history, continuous war: but this is not the language of historians. Look at the history you have lived through yourself. Even in that brief space you see purposes working themselves out; hindrances being gathered in and transmuted within and for the general movements, and these general movements coming together into one; so that the whole period, over all countries, has its peculiar characteristic. Read such a book as the *Golden Bough* and see what cruelty superstition always produces, how knowledge intercourse civilization have removed superstition and its resultant cruelty. Study history of past centuries in detail and see how this change has been gradually and steadily brought about. It is impossible to miss the purpose, and the purpose towards good, that has been at work. And if you object that much good has been also lost in the process, then consider whether the adage be not true, that you cannot have the best without giving up the second best.

How explain all this? Perhaps any explanation must be more or less metaphorical; but can we express our sense of all this better than by the phrase, A universal Spirit rules?

But if so, we can define that Spirit more closely. The more diligently we examine the various contributions of nations empires philosophies religions, and these in their widely extended different periods, the more we are impelled to recognize that the gospel period, the life of our Lord in Palestine, and the apostolic movement which sprang from it, is the centre to which all leads and then spreads out again. And that is but another way of expressing the doctrine of the Christ, the Jewish doctrine of the divine kingdom completed as the apostolic doctrine. That kingdom has now been inaugurated by our Lord Jesus. That kingdom is a Spirit already working through the world; the Spirit, the Christ Spirit, which is

Himself, the Christ not after the flesh. He is now enthroned King, ruling from the centre, sitting at God's right hand. At last His rule will be fulfilled. He will appear in glory. Then He will deliver His kingdom to the Father, and God shall be all in all.

There is metaphor or symbol here. Much of the traditional Jewish scenery still adorns the inherited Jewish faith; a second best which will be given up by degrees to make way for deeper truth, even in apostolic times. That matters the less when, looking closer, we perceive what the nature of this Spirit is even from the first. The Gospel is the centre, the hinge, of history; but the cross is the centre of the Gospel. The sacrifice of love, mercy instead of justice, glory in humiliation, victory by defeat, that is the Spirit of the Christ. That is the Spirit which rules through history. So far as history has been a record of folly cruelty failure, it has been where that Spirit has been overborne. The recoveries, the setting strongly again of the tide of purpose, have come through the restoration of that mild yet burning Spirit. And since Jesus died as the Christ upon the cross that Spirit has in quite new measure influenced men. Men nations generations have resisted denied been proud been cowardly; but never since then with easy conscience. Since then men have known of what Spirit they are. Since then there has been a new life, at least inaugurated, in the Messianic Spirit:

O God, who didst wonderfully constitute the nature of men, and still more wonderfully hast reformed it; grant that by this mystery we may be made partakers of His divinity who deigned to partake in our humanity.

The Person of Christ. There is the second chapter: Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews, Thou art the Christ.

All knowledge flows into the one truth, enlarging revelation, and being itself cleansed as it enters. How deeply has man's knowledge of the world he dwells in been increased during the last hundred years. *Mundo maiore sive communi*, said Francis Bacon: a larger universe and that a commonwealth. We do enjoy a larger universe. And we do understand our human plan in it, our kinship with the whole order, better than we used. And now the discoveries of science are running into wonders; barriers are melting into great influences, and matter appears strangely sacramental toward Spirit. Art no longer represents the face and form of man alone. Nature is no longer a mere background. In that human representation some skill has waned. The modest glory of our age is in landscape. Is there in this another second best gradually receding before an advancing better? And though most of us

are neither men of science nor artists, what sweetness and power we all find in nature: Consider the lilies of the field how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin: and yet I say unto you that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Such words of our Lord, that aspect of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, touches the modern still more closely than it did the ancient heart.

Has it not sometimes happened to you that you look upon some scene and gradually forget yourself in its beauty? And at a certain moment, without your effort or expectation, your enjoyment is become intense, a harmony never noticed before brings a strange understanding; it is as though the idea descended as from another world; it is as though, not *a* spirit, but Spirit in spiritual perfection, spoke with you in signs that are more than signs. How difficult to express what nevertheless has an inward clearness, clearer than everyday vision. But a kind of expression is afforded by familiar words: There is neither speech nor language, but their voices are heard among them; In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him . . . in Him was life, and the life was the light of men. . . . And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father) full of grace and truth.

And if you put Psalm and Gospel together, you will perceive how the Gospel has advanced in clearness and precision; how what might (we sometimes fear) be fancy becomes truth, self-evident in clearness, in reasonableness, through the Gospel. The grace and truth of the Lord Jesus dwelling dying rising, present evermore by Spirit with His disciples, is all one with this divine meaning in nature. The mystery of nature is one with the mystery of the Person of Christ.

Think that out; get it vivid. Then other aspects of nature will fall also into place. For nature is not all beauty and consolation. Storm and strength; that, indeed, may be beautiful too. But there is more. There is a secret at the heart of nature's action; something sinister, something men cannot trust—or so it seems. But think of Jesus Christ and His redemption; the tragedy, the fated tragedy of Judas; the cross with all the evil passions which made it the means of our salvation, of our—of whose salvation? It is S. John who gives us this doctrine of the Word—in S. John it seems almost intended to supersede the too merely national doctrine of the Christ—and it is S. John who declares what no apostolic writer had explicitly declared before: " And if any man sin, we

have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world." And at the end of the same epistle he writes: "We know that whosoever is begotten of God, sinneth not; but he that was begotten of God keepeth him, and the evil one toucheth him not. We know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in evil. And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we know Him that is true, and we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life." Here, again, we have an Old Testament oracle opened with richer precision. In Isaiah it had been already said: "I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I am the Lord that doeth all these things." Evil is not the simple absolute thing we hastily suppose. It has not the abiding reality of goodness. It can be transmuted into its good original—cleansing fouled streams as they run to the sea. And now that the Son of God is come, this can be understood and accomplished.

Of this, more presently. Here let us sum up our third chapter in the Person of Christ. We have had Ecce Homo; then Jesus of Nazareth, King or Christ of the Jews. Now we have the Word of God, the light of all men, the life through all creation.

But now again: this transmutation of evil; how can it be accomplished? We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not, says S. John. The Lord Jesus has gathered into Himself a company of brothers who are henceforward sinless, like Himself. That is not a heresy of S. John's. S. Paul had a like standard of churchmanship, and it is derived from our Lord's own word: "Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." S. John, even more plainly than S. Paul, recognizes the frequent failure of his brothers to keep this perfection. But failure, sin, means nothing less than falling away from the divine fellowship. Through Jesus Christ the Advocate, recovery is possible. And the blood of Jesus Christ gradually cleanses those who are sincere from all sin at last.

This brotherhood or fellowship of Christlike men is the instrument, the pervading spiritual influence by which the evil one is abolished, and the whole world lying in evil is rescued. The evil is not transmuted by ignoring or denying it, but by facing it in sinless boldness.

Yes, that is the work and destiny of the Church, S. Paul would say. S. John agrees. Only S. John, bent on restoring

to its heroism the idea of churchmanship, will never use the name Church: perhaps, like Faith, the name had become trite through custom and controversy.

S. Paul wrote a treatise on the Church, the Epistle to the Ephesians. He calls it there the Body of the Lord Jesus Christ, the fulness of Him who is all in all being fulfilled. (That is the only possible translation of Ephesians i. 22; as the Vulgate has it, and as Dr. Armitage Robinson has restored it to English readers.) You see what it means if you look on to chapter iv., and read: "The building up of the body of Christ, till we all attain unto one full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Christ, the Christ, is not the Lord Jesus by Himself, but the Lord Jesus together with men, as He gathers them to Himself in the Christ. In Christ, members of Christ; these are no mere metaphors. This was the doctrine of the Christ in the Jewish Church, which the Christian Church inherited. This is what the Athanasian Creed means in the verse: "One Christ: one; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking of the Manhood into God." This is what Tennyson meant when he sang: "Ring in the Christ that is to be."

And this inherited traditional catholic doctrine must be kept in mind by all who would give full value to the Gospel according to S. John. Once that Gospel was valued, because it so plainly asserted the divinity of our Lord. Then it was considered to be doubtful history, because such assertion seemed so different from the earlier Gospels in which the Lord scarce seems to claim so much as Christship for Himself. Now we read S. John again with larger understanding of apostolic thought, and we see that the great claims of divine sonship, of unity with the Father, are all associated with the promise of like sonship and like communion for all the faithful, the trustful children of the Father: "That they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in Us: that the world may believe that Thou didst send Me. And the glory which Thou hast given Me, I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as We are One; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be perfected into one; that the world may know that Thou didst send Me, and lovedst them, even as Thou lovest Me."

Jesus our Lord is one with the Father, is with God, is God, not as being thereby separated from other men, but as being thereby able to draw all men into Himself and to lift them with Him into the peace joy holiness of God. The inclusive Christ, really and truly Mediator; there is the fourth chapter of the Person of Christ.

The Word became flesh and dwelt among us. How strange —that obscure Galilean life—that the supreme, the one incarnation of deity? Have we no misgiving? Let us boldly say aloud what many must now and again feel. This seems too small, too common, to be so tremendous, so unique. Nay, those are not the words required, and we shall never find the words required. There are no such words, for we have no such thoughts. No explanation we can offer comprehends a moiety of what we believe the Gospel story means, stands for, presents in vital symbol. But we can neither conceive nor desire any other than that story. Solomon in all his glory instead of the lilies of the field? No, no.

The immense truth is touched with history. Yet history is not more essential to the faith than other elements in the manifestation. How limited and broken are the records. Even before criticism scores the lines of limitation deep, we all see that by common sense. The character, example of our Lord Jesus: how much of that as it lives for us is drawn from history; how much is the dream of the adoring Church?

But is a dream less true than history? Not if it is continually coming true, passing into fresh realizations. And is not that just what happens here? As fair a description of history still in the making as any other would be. The dream of the Christ coming true.

Jesus of Nazareth: that is a particular person. The word of God: that is an idea. And when we try to think about the Person of Christ there is a recurring clash of logic in our minds, of affection and reverence in our conscience, between person and idea. When in the last discourse the Master said: "I am the way, the truth, the life," He certainly meant more than: I lead the way, I tell the truth, I give you life. We seem to see the person, the familiar loved Master, unclothing Himself of personal adornment, and taking on again the august abstractions of the Word in the prologue—light, life.

But is there contradiction here? No more than when S. Paul says: "The one mediator, himself a man; and yet: We henceforth know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more." Not Christ, nor yet any other: there is a real life in the Spirit which all may live together; and in Spirit what we mean by person and what we mean by idea are reconciled.

But Spirit means Spirit of God, God's goodness. God is spirit. God is love. To be of one substance with the Father is to be of one Spirit, for there is no substance—*i.e.*, essence, reality—but Spirit; and that is therefore to be one in the

perfection of the good. So indeed we may hope that at last God may be all in all.

There seems, therefore, no irreverence in applying Dante's words about Beatrice to his Lord and hers and ours, the one Saviour of all sinful men and women:

> Perchè il piacere della sua beltate
> partendo sè dalla nostra veduta,
> divenne spirital bellezza grande,
> che per lo cielo spande
> luce d' amor, che gli angeli saluta,
> e lo intelletto loro alto e sottile
> face maravigliar; tanto è gentile.

(The grace of thy beauty, departing from our natural vision, became a spiritual splendour very great; which throughout heaven spreads the light of love; which light salutes the angels, and makes their deep and subtle intellect to wonder: so noble and humane it is.)

A. NAIRNE.

JESUS OUR REDEEMER

THERE is a word which we always associate with Christianity; that word is "liberty." The Christian is a free man, and he owes his freedom to Christ. Hence the exhortation to the baptized: "Ye brethren were called for freedom: for freedom did Christ set us free." Up to a certain stage in its growth humanity is in bondage. This bondage man cannot break of himself. Deliverance must come to him from without. As a matter of Christian experience the Deliverer is He whom we name the Lord Jesus Christ. Jesus is our Redeemer.

The term "bondage" covers everything which retards man's spiritual progress—which bars or restricts the communion of man with God. To one obsessed with the idea that the world in which we dwell is the creation of any other than the God of goodness—the belief that it is at the mercy or malice of capricious spirits, or in the grip of a Prince of Darkness, it would be impossible to feel that all things work together for good. Again, through fear of death, men may be all their lifetime subject to bondage: their ethical outlook and their hopes are bounded by the grave. There are religious observances which at their best fail to promote the ascent of the soul to God; St. Paul alludes to such when he speaks of "the handwriting of ordinances that was against us." It is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin from the human heart. Nor will scrupulous obedience of rules and maxims help man far: a legalistic mind is apt to

become inelastic and sterile. Even the moral law, by itself, defeats its own ends, in a being "carnal, sold under sin," because the higher the standard which it sets up, the greater the despair it creates of attainment. Of all such conceptions the Life and Teaching, the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus Christ have actually been the solvent in the experience of all who have surrendered themselves to His Person. In respect of every form of bondage He is our Redeemer, our Deliverer.

His highest claim to the title is, however, drawn from the fact that He has made us free from sin. When we reflect on the matter, we perceive that all false conceptions lead inevitably to what is misdoing in the sight of God. Sin is the common heritage of every kind of spiritual slavery. Here is something of which we all have direct, if imperfect, knowledge. By what we know of the sin, we can judge somewhat of the heart in which it grows. Now Christian experience confirms the statement of Scripture: "In the Lord Jesus we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins." How the result is produced we may be baffled to discover. But we may reverently attempt to comprehend one aspect of the process.

I.

We start from the consciousness of sin in the sinner. No question of the bondage of sin can arise for human consideration until man is conscious of sin. It is of consciousness of sin, not of crime, that we must think. As long as man views his misdoing merely as offending his fellows, he feels guilty of crime or of what his fellows will deem to be crime. Misdoing is felt to be sin only when it is regarded as in some way affecting our relations with God. We know intuitively that God judges such doing to be done amiss. The emotions which the consciousness of sin will stir vary according to the degree of spiritual life which the sinner has reached. At the lowest point the only result will be a vague dread of consequences. On the higher levels the sinner recognizes that he has mistrusted and contradicted God, and has acted in a manner unworthy of his manhood. The recognition will be painful and cover him with confusion: it may, and probably will, make him shrink from God. He is aware that he has rejected God's purposes, thwarted God's designs, and interrupted his fellowship with God to the extent of being alienated from the life (the vitality) of God. Such sense of guilt left to itself leads to recklessness, or to remorse and despair. In either event the soul has been brought into bondage—bound with fetters which keep it back from God. How shall it be freed ?

There are those who would heal the soul's hurt slightly, by weakening the sense of guilt. The reality of the sinner's responsibility is denied by some doctrine of determinism or fatalism. Even God's existence is called into doubt. The standards of moral conduct are derided. We are bidden to efface from our memory what we have done, or have failed to do, as a folly which we should be wise to forget. Not by such means is good brought out of evil. Failure leads to success only if there be a rebound. The tide creeps on, even while it falls back at each wave, because its recession is to prepare for an advance. To palliate sin, to weaken the sense of guilt, to shut our eyes to its real character, is not the way to spiritual growth. We need to be made sorry—sorry after a godly sort. "Godly sorrow," says St. Paul, "works indignation, fear, longing, zeal, and avenging." The self in its revulsion turns round upon itself; and, with a reaction of wrath against its former mood, presses on afresh towards its goal. We want the exceeding sinfulness of sin to be deepened, not lessened, within us: that is part, at least, of the process of Redemption.

There is, however, something more required than to have our guiltiness made vivid. Man's soul is not mere matter to be moved mechanically. It will not react to the most potent stimulant, unless it be animated with hope and desire. And hope and desire, to be effectual, must enter alongside of the deeper sorrow for sin. The soul cannot be said to have started on its road to liberty, until sorrow for sin is characterized at once by a hatred of sin, as sin appears to God, and by the hope and desire for reconciliation with Him. The soul cannot evolve this sorrow of itself: a force or influence from without is needed, which through one and the same action can produce these two opposite strains within the same consciousness. We look for such influence or force in vain, except in the Cross of Jesus Christ.

The death of our Lord on Calvary draws its meaning and power to save from the life which preceded and the life which followed it. The life of Him is one; a life obedient to God even unto death, yea, the death of the Cross, passing triumphant through death to exaltation and glory. This is the background to our vision of the Cross. It is the background which gives to the Cross its real horror and its wondrous attraction. Of Jesus, the Father said at each stage of His incarnate life: "This is My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." But the world rejected Him and crucified Him. Two diverse spirits clashed finally at the Cross: the Spirit of Christ and the spirit of the world. There the wickedness of mankind seemed drawn to a head by the attracting power of goodness. Wicked-

ness and goodness were shown in their strongest antagonism. The fundamental passions of evil concentrated themselves in fury upon the Person of the Sinless One. The appalling contrast between the Beloved of God and His treatment by man revealed the nature of sin, and its ultimate consequences, as nothing else could have done. To absolute goodness, which paltered not with sin, nor ever distrusted God, the sinful race had no welcome to offer save the Passion and the Cross. "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh . . . condemned sin in the flesh."

Yet this is not the whole effect of the Cross. To have emphasized the exceeding sinfulness of sin, without offering the hope of deliverance from its bondage, would still further have dejected the human race. To have achieved that result alone would have but exalted the majesty of law which cannot give life. The Cross has another, and concurrent, message for fallen humanity. The death of the Lord Jesus Christ was the expression of the boundless love of God. That is what the early Christians thought of it, as their records testify: "Hereby know we Love, because He laid down His life for us." "Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." "God commendeth His love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us." "I am the Good Shepherd: the Good Shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep. . . . I lay down My life for the sheep." The thought of such love increases our shame for humanity become His enemy, and at the same time fills us with gratitude, desire, and hope. "The love of Christ constraineth me." Without it the deepest sense of guilt would fail to react in amendment of life. "I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto Me."

The love of Christ is one, even as His life is one. The love which breathed in parable, or relieved suffering and want, is the same that at the last yielded the Spirit into the Father's hands. Each manifestation of His love before and after death contributes to the force which stirs the heart to contrition. But the death was the final test of its reality; and the Cross is the symbol of its power. Therefore it is that the redemptive work of Christ centres in His death. It marked a crisis in the history of the world. It was a great cosmic act without which humanity could not, in fact, have been freed from sin, because without it humanity could not have attained to such penitence as would raise it Godwards. Viewed as God views it from the throne, whence He follows with loving interest each step by which man ascends towards his goal, the death of Christ was the one thing wanted—the supreme sacrifice of love to set man free from his brute-heritage, the one oblation

which could satisfy God's yearning to accomplish His eternal purposes.

Surely here we have the reason why Christ must die for sins. It was from love of man that God demanded the sacrifice of Calvary from His only Son, that the Son deliberately surrendered Himself to die. Only love so tried could enable man to rise to his full capacity. Therefore, God spared not His Son, but delivered Him up for us all; and therefore the Son laid down His life of Himself. The salvation of mankind, its deliverance from bondage, its release from the chains which clogged its upward progress, depended on that " sparing not " of the Father, and that " giving Himself " of the Son. Through that demand, and through that obedience—each made in love with mutual understanding and sympathy—there was brought redemption to the whole race of man. Christ's death altered God's relations with man—not that God had ever ceased to love, but hitherto that love had been thwarted and rebuffed. By virtue of Christ's sacrifice man can now become responsive to the Holy Spirit, and God can proceed in His gracious work of gathering together in one all things in Christ.

Thus considered, the doctrine of the Atonement finds its proper place among the laws of the universe. We no longer interpret it as if it alleged certain arbitrary transactions between God and man. It assigns a reasonable cause for certain spiritual phenomena, which (so far as we can see) can be produced in no other way. And if we are Theists, we cannot separate such laws from God. They may be such as, by His very nature, He is obliged to posit and to obey, unless, forsooth, He deny Himself. At all events, they emanate from Him: they are expressions of His Holy Will. Therefore, ultimately the sacrifice of the death of Christ was demanded by the Father of the Son. And it is the eternal glory of the Son Incarnate that He perceived the Father's Will and fulfilled it. The death, like the teaching, the rejection, and the suffering, was part of the work which the Father appointed Him to do; to die on the Cross was to finish the work. This was the cup which the Father gave Him to drink. The Christian wonders at which to marvel most: whether at the insight which could divine thus inerrably the methods of God, or at the love which shrank from nothing needed for their consummation!

II.

Our considerations so far have led us to the death of Christ on the Cross as the centre of His redemptive work. We have attempted to view its place in human history, as God Himself

sees it with His all-seeing eyes. Its significance is revealed to to us when we trace back to it, as we can trace back to nothing else, those elements which must be set up in our hearts before our redemption, our deliverance, from the bondage of sin, can be effected. Every tree is known by its fruit. Christian penitence is the fruit of the Crucifixion—the Crucifixion, that is, as seen against the background of the Personality which "endured the Cross, despising the shame, and is set down at the right hand of the throne of God." We must not, however, be content with perceiving the significance of Christ's death for the human race at large. It has, and is intended to have, a significance for each member of mankind. What was done once for all, must be reproduced in the individual soul. The emotions and effects due to it then, must be felt and appropriated now, unless Christ is dead in vain. The Son of God loved me and gave Himself for me.

The story of the woman which was a sinner, as related by St. Luke, describes the process of redemption reproducing itself in the individual throughout the ages. To bring out the meaning of the story for ourselves, let us reconstruct it in some such way as this. There was once upon a time a woman who was notorious for her fast life and her sins. She grasped the pleasure of the moment without fear of God or regard for man. She was the idol of many; and their friendship (it seemed to her) more than compensated for the criticisms of an outraged public. Her conscience was drugged to sleep, if it was not dead in trespasses and sins. But there came a day when Jesus, the Prophet of Nazareth, crossed her path. Perhaps in a spirit of bravado she set herself to speak to Him. Perhaps she was curious to hear Him preach. For the first time she came into touch with One who stirred her inmost being with repulsion for sin, and with a yearning to live a better life. The more she saw of Him, the more she felt constrained to respond to the call of her higher self. It was not so much what He said and did, as His personality which moved her. His transparent goodness, and His inexhaustible love, tried and vexed by the world in which He moved, began to convert her. At last contrition was ripe within. She followed Him to the Pharisee's house as a public penitent. The copious tears which she shed, the abandon of her grief, the publicity of her confession, were her way of expressing a broken and contrite heart which, she knew, He would not despise. That He was the Author of her penitence she never doubted, as she kissed His feet and anointed them with the ointment in gratitude. Even if He could do nothing more for her, she felt grateful; because of what He had made her feel, her life henceforth would be lived as He would approve,

even if she never ceased to weep. But He who had done great things for her already had still another gift in store. She needed pardon and peace. So Jesus, turning to her, pronounced the sentence of Absolution, His creative word, which set her free from bondage. "He said unto her, thy sins are forgiven . . . go in peace."

That you and I may experience the redeeming love of Jesus to the full, we must become more perfect in penitence. And there is only one road to such contrition; we must go to Him, and learn of Him in faith. His personality will mean more to us than it meant to the poor woman in the story. She knew Him in part. His superlative holiness and the intensity of His love were not revealed fully until tested by the Passion. It is as we gaze at the Cross that we exclaim: "So God loved." Besides, we have the further knowledge of Him which His Resurrection and Ascension have disclosed. If the partial vision of Him could convert the woman in the Gospel, what may not the clearer vision of Him work in us? Yet we shall never attain even to her contrition, unless we make His presence as real to ourselves as it was to her. We must daily expose ourselves to His gracious influence. In mental prayer, contemplation, and communion, we must set Him before our face and hear Him as He speaks to us. Then, in our deepening penitence, we shall experience His power to save. And this experience will lead on to more. As for her, so for us He has the blessing of Absolution. What a difference there is between promise and fulfilment—between the conviction that God will forgive, and the knowledge that He has forgiven me! Until it is absolved, the contrite heart is still bound with one fetter, the fetter of sadness which clogs its upward steps. The sentence of Absolution is God's word, the word of Him who speaks, and it is done. It breaks the last link of our bonds. It sets us rejoicing on our way, free in very deed from everything which keeps us back from God, conscious of our portion in the glorious liberty of the children of God. Thus, in each pardoned child, Christ sees of the travail of His soul; and each worthy recipient of Absolution becomes a witness to the world of the redeeming power of Jesus.

C. MONEMUTEN.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD IN THE SOUL

FOR every thousand readers of the *Pilgrim's Progress*, I wonder how many have read the *Holy War*—it is almost necessary to add, by the same author. I suppose we shall always prefer the *Pilgrim's Progress*, but of the two the *Holy War* is by far

the more modern in its treatment of the spiritual problem. John Bunyan was sufficiently Catholic a Puritan to have anticipated modern psychology. When he wanted to talk about the kingdom of God in the soul, he depicted the soul as a city. To him the soul was a multiple. Mansoul, the city won over by Diabolus and retaken after a mort of trouble by Emmanuel, was a mighty populous place—a place not unlike Newcastle, for he describes it as "a city for its situation so commodious, for its privileges so advantageous, for its building so curious, that I may say of it there is not its equal under the whole heaven." Moreover, it was a quite modern city. Mansoul had its Lord Mayor and sheriffs and recorder; its chief constable, magistrates, and police. The only official Bunyan does not mention is the bishop. Perhaps he had good reason for the omission. Under these illustrious citizens was a vast concourse of free electors.

Such is the soul according to Bunyan. And the New Psychology is very much the old Bunyan. To-day we regard the soul as a multitude, a "vast concourse of free electors." We had got into the way of regarding the soul as an entity, a "person" possessed of a mysterious organ called the "will." I am not sure how we came by the notion, nor does it much matter. I believe we are indebted to the New Psychology, despite some phases which are doubtless erroneous and transient, for recalling us to an earlier and more rational and more Christian interpretation of the soul and its main problem, the interpretation of St. Augustine and St. Paul and Plato—Plato who in the *Republic* lays such stress on the initial multiple-nature of the soul, and tells us that its main problem is ἕνα γενέσθαι ἐκ πολλῶν (out of many to become one).

"Out of many to become one"—that is the problem, "yours, mine, everyone's." It is to the solution of this problem that the Catholic religion, so far as concerns the individual, addresses itself. And the great first principle it offers us is this: that man, this multiple being, is a creature, and interior unity can only be gained by the subordination of all the elements in the soul to that which transcends it—namely, the Will of God. It is only a city at unity with itself when completely subject to Emmanuel. This principle, as you are aware, underlies the whole Catholic philosophy of man. It is the basis of the Ignatian Exercises. Unity, entity, self-realization through submission to the Divine Will. "Out of many to become one." Man becomes man only in proportion as the Kingdom of God takes effect within him. His will only emerges in the Will of God. Our will is not, as we had imagined, the organ of surrender; it is the product of surrender. The organ of surrender

is desire, kindled before baptism by actual grace, and after baptism by habitual grace also. It is in desire, not in will, that the power of "choice" resides. This is an Aristotelian principle which, again, has been confirmed by the New Psychology, while a Greater than Aristotle or the moderns threw the whole weight of our response upon desire. "If a man *love* Me, he will keep My words, and My Father will love him, and We will come to him and make Our abode with him." When we find Aristotle and modern psychologists placing the seat of choice in the appetite, speaking of "choice" as Bishop Temple does in his lectures on the *Nature of Personality*, as "an appetitive function," does it not throw a luminous comment on our Lord's words: "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled"? I am emphasizing this point because of the high place which love or desire holds in the Catholic doctrine of the soul's restoration to unity. It is the desire which reacts to those great historic facts which underlie the possibility of our restoration—the Incarnation and the Atonement. We desire Him because He first desired us. I believe Faber was profoundly right in the prominence he gave to the desire for God:

> All the hard would be easy, all the tangles unwound,
> Wouldst thou only desire as well as obey.

I feel sure that in the light of the psychological as well as the Catholic interpretation of the soul, we must cease to talk about the "will," and put the *desire* in its place. And closely akin to desire, if not indeed part of it, is humility, *i.e.*, amazement that God should desire *us*, and penitence, *i.e.*, grief at having wounded His love.

The whole sacramental life of the Church is divinely ordained in harmony with these great principles. Baptism is the Divine invasion of the soul, the fulfilment of the words "the Kingdom of God is within you." In the Puritan's phrase it is the return of Emmanuel to Mansoul, and the establishment of His seat of government there. And the other sacraments are provided to strengthen and extend that government, as well as to enlist those elements in the soul already subject to God's rule in bringing "every thought into captivity to the law of Christ." Hence the devout life, with its prayer, penance, mortification, and other duties, which is, so to speak, doing missionary work to other parts of the soul. The task is not accomplished in a moment. It is not accomplished even in a lifetime. The Church's vision casts beyond the present scene to the complete unity of soul under conditions which cannot obtain in this present state of probation.

But the point I wish particularly to bring before you to-day is the imperative necessity of our continually forming majorities within us in favour of God. The real burden of the spiritual life—so far as I know my own—is that of incomplete surrender. It is an odd kink in theology that turned the doctrine of "election" upside down, and made God elect man instead of man electing God. The long tragedy of sin has for its theme a rejected God. No doubt there is a sense in which we can speak of human nature as "reprobate," yet the awful and amazing truth is that it is God Who is reprobate! He has been "turned down," and not yet with any of us has He fully come into His own.

We should do well to go aside again and again, and squarely face the question: "Do we want God?" Honestly given, the answer will be a mixed one. I think it will always be a mixed one here. There are so many of us!—so many in each of us. Each one is a microcosm of the world to which Christ came. Each of us is compounded of Scribes and Pharisees, publicans and sinners. To the former Christ is as inconvenient as ever. To the latter He is the most lovely and lovable good. Here is all the business of a ballot, as when Pilate was Procurator of Judea. Now there is a majority for Christ; now a minority. Now the Will of God is paramount; now it is nowhere at all. In some things I seek first the Kingdom of God; in a thousand others I want my own way. I am partly a Christian; I am very largely a pagan. It is this interior division that lends temptation its power, and robs faith of its force; that calls for repeated conversion, and renders progress so slow, so unequal, so inconsistent.

And yet—it is precisely this dissension that is a ground for encouragement and hope! Never now does the whole of the multitude that is "you" cry with one voice "Crucify Him!" Tumult is not rejection. The soul at odds with itself is at least not wholly against Christ. We who are in revolt against ourselves have the Holy Spirit to lead the revolution. Never say: "I am full of cross purposes; the Kingdom of God is not for me." Rather say: "Now is my soul divided, wherefore my redemption draweth nigh." Doomed only to redeeming strife there rises a rose-dawn of hope. There will be within you wars and discords and factions until, through successive options, the un-Godlike is eliminated, and there reigns at length "at-one-ment," and you have realized through harmony with the Will of God both personality and will. *Sua Voluntade e nostra pace.*

We need to become more habituated to the thought of God-control. If the Kingdom of God mean anything, it means

that. Whereas we continually assume an egoistic standpoint. For instance, I ask God to "help me," but it isn't a case of God helping me; it's a case of God *making* me! In almost every confession we lament our "loss of self-control." We haven't any "self-control." A creature has nothing to do with "self-control." Either he is controlled by his Creator or by something or someone that has taken the Creator's place. Take that perennial subject of contrition, "my temper." We habitually regard "temper" as a sort of dangerous lunatic which escapes our vigilance and becomes a lunatic at large. What is wrong with "temper"? In itself, nothing. It is a valuable emotion, indispensable to our religious life—while under control of the Spirit of Christ. We cannot control it, for the simple reason that it is ourselves, a phase or expression of the multitude within us. What we want is God-control, and, to that end, a more intense desire. The Church teaches us to pray, not for self-control, but that "the Holy Spirit may in all things direct and rule our hearts." If you examine the collects, from the Office of Baptism onwards, you will find that they consistently teach us to pray for God-control.

Take another example. I do not think we are ever so aware how multiple we are as when we try to pray. The complaint of "wandering thoughts" is, again, the burden of nearly every confession. No sooner have we knelt down than a multitude of thoughts come crowding in—at least, that is how it seems to us. We think of ourselves as an "ego" distracted by a troop of uninvited guests. What has happened is this: our attention, abstracted from ordinary duties, has become conscious of the multitudinous "self." You call these "wandering thoughts"; I say they are *you*. As through the microscope you see the riotous constituents of a drop of water, so in the attempt to pray you become aware of the riotous constituents of your "you." Those "wandering thoughts" are you. You are always like that. What is to be done? The "thoughts" must be prayed about as they arise, as you become conscious of them. The business difficulty, the next half holiday, the question of dress, the visit to the theatre, the state of Ireland, the Vicar's want of tact—you say these things prevent you from "saying your prayers"; but what are you doing with formal prayer when such a host of your conscious self is clamouring to be prayed for? Pray about them as they arise, desire intensely that the Spirit of God shall order and govern them, and you are satisfying the very instinct that brought you to your knees.

We have so much to unlearn! We need to get rid of the mythological way we have got into of regarding ourselves—

the ego and the "will," and the lunatic temper, and the "wandering thoughts"—it is all mythological, all fantasy! The truth about ourselves, and consequently about salvation, is so much simpler. Each of us is a bundle of desires, motives, affections, and so forth, quite unco-ordinated, and incapable of self-co-ordination. Each one of these constituents must be brought into subjection to the Divine Will by desire and faith and sacrament. You know how a kettle boils: by the particles of water at the bottom of the kettle nearest the heat being expanded and passing to the top, and making room for the cold particles to pass under and be heated in turn, till the whole is converted into a unity of vapour. In the same way, by much the same process, the disconnected particles that make up your "you" are to be transformed into "newness of life," into unity, beauty, yes, and *power*. They are to be transformed, they are being transformed, if you are faithful, into "personality" and "will," by heat from that fire which He came to send upon earth, and which is localized and concentrated in all the ordinances of His Church. That is why I believe in the Catholic Church, because it is the localization of transforming grace. You hear people object to the localization of religion. They want it diffused. They want to do away with the difference between sacred and secular, sacrament and meal, work and worship. They would put the fire into the kettle! Well, you know what will happen if you do. That is what has always happened with well-meant attempts to do without sacraments and holy-days, and places of worship and means of grace. The water, heated for a moment, has quenched the fire. It is the Divine wisdom of the Church to concentrate the heat at one point at one time.

But do not content yourselves with admiring the wisdom of this provision, deep as the constitution of man, and modern beyond all New Psychologies. Get to work. Let your deep desire for God go in and out among the multitude of your soul, like my Lord Will-be-will in the *Holy War*, canvassing all the constituents in the interests of Emmanuel, christening every thought, project, and motive it can find. See that each particle of your complex reaches the heat of sacramental grace. Beware—let me utter in conclusion a note of warning—beware of the formalism which has hitherto been the tragedy of institutional religion the world over. Here, in the Catholic Church, you have the most admirable contrivance of the loving wisdom of our God, yet by a mechanical use of it you will turn it into the most futile of all the encumbrances of the soul. *Corruptio optimi pessima*. I shall not be assimilated to the Kingdom of God by the mere observance of rules. I shall not be a Catholic

merely by hearing Mass regularly, and going to my duties, or even receiving my Communion. Mansoul is not to be saved by magic. We need to remember this morning, noon, and night. We need rigorously to apply to ourselves the apostle's saying about Israel: "He is not a Catholic who is one outwardly, but inwardly; and the true conformity is not of the letter, but of the spirit." I say deliberately that a mechanical Catholicism has rendered God's task with the soul more difficult than all the other inventions of the devil. Is English Catholicism going to avoid this snare? I have faith that it will. Nay, I go further, and, returning from some weeks on the Continent, I do honestly believe that the Church of England is the one part of the Catholic Church where the grace of God is manifestly triumphing through ordinances and not in spite of them. And in saying this I comprehend all parties in the Church of England, and I say it as one who is perhaps as little complacent, and as critically alert as any of you. But if this *realization* of the Kingdom is to be maintained, it can only be by each one of us bringing every element in his multiple soul to the feet of the Redeemer. Business, pleasure, duty, interests, ambitions, affections, failures; all extension of our personality in the shape of ledgers, offices; typewriters, bills of sale, and business affairs must be laid under contribution. Nothing must be kept out of touch with the Spirit of God. The Kingdom must be universal in the soul if it is to be universal in the world.

And as I began my address with reference to Bunyan's second great allegory, let me remind you in conclusion of the speech of Emmanuel to the citizens of Mansoul after He had obtained entrance into the city. He had not yet gained possession of the entire city. There were still quarters in rebellion, but He garrisoned it afresh and provided it with all that was needful for its perfect subordination to Himself. Reading that speech as a Catholic, I think it little short of inspiration that a Puritan should have penned such a description of the Catholic Church. It is too long to quote in full. These sentences must suffice. Hear them, and report them to the multitude dwelling within you:

"Thou seest what a company of My Father's host I have lodged within thy borders: captains and rulers; soldiers and men of war; engines and excellent devices to subdue and bring down thy foes. Thou knowest my meaning, O Mansoul. They are My servants and thine too. Yea, My design in possessing thee of them, and the natural tendency of each of them, is to defend, purge, strengthen, and sweeten thee for Myself, and to make thee meet for My Father's presence, blessing, and glory; for thou, O Mansoul, art created to be prepared for these."

T. J. HARDY.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH

THERE can be few subjects more inspiring than the subject we are asked to consider, the Holy Spirit and the Catholic Church in England. It is concerned with vital religion, and it brings us into touch with all that is noblest and strongest and best in our history. But it covers a wide area. Even if you neglect the story of Roman Britain and start with St. Columba and St. Augustine, you have spread out before you more than 1,300 years of continuous Church life. Clearly we can only take a bird's-eye view of most of it, looking a little more closely at the later story—but always remembering that the whole record of the English Church is the story of the work of God the Holy Spirit within the society in which He dwells.

To begin with, you see His work in the conversion of the various heathen kingdoms: it takes up roughly the first hundred years. Then you see it most clearly in the centuries that follow in the line of men and women who are most evidently inspired by Him. Martyrs like King Eadmund and Archbishop Ælfeah, missionaries like Boniface and Willibrord, scholars like Bede and Alcuin, and King Ælfred and Anselm, reformers like Dunstan and Lanfranc.

In epoch after epoch the fire of love burns low, but always you see it rise up again in tongues of flame. In the twelfth century you see a great zeal for the monastic life, and religious houses spring up like flowers all over England; in the thirteenth century you see the not less amazing results which follow the coming of the Friars.

And as the Middle Ages draw to their end, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, if there be no specially great names, yet the churches of those days, and the Decorated and then the Perpendicular style in which they are built, witness to the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts and minds of men. For it has been said most truly that "the ecclesiastical buildings of a country are no bad criterion of its religious condition,"* and the English churches of the period show that in the Church of England at the end of the Middle Ages God left not Himself without witness, and the fruit of His Spirit can be seen in the workmanship of those temples that are made with hands.

* Wakeman, *History of the Church of England*, 8th edition, p. 181.

With the sixteenth century comes the Reformation, and for the better part of 200 years the Middle Ages are followed by a time of storm and stress. The old order is ruthlessly attacked, part of it is overturned, institutions and practices to which English Christians have been used since the Conversion are involved in a tempest and an earthquake. The first stage ends with what we call the Elizabethan Settlement, and the results, so far, can be summed up broadly in the words of the writer to the Hebrews: there has been "a removing of those things that were shaken, as of those things that were made,"* but the things that cannot be shaken remain. It is impossible not to hear above that storm the voice of the Holy Spirit, but with His voice you hear also the voices which are not His, the tongues of self-seekers and schemers and sycophants and scoundrels. But at each critical turning-point of the story you find a strange overruling—what Nehemiah calls "the good hand of my God"†—overruling the designs of man. There is a moment when it seems as if the Church is to be allied with the Lutherans in Germany; a little later, and it looks as though the Church is to break loose from historical Christianity and cast in her lot with Calvin and the Reformed in Geneva and in France. The policy of Henry VIII. and the mind of Archbishop Cranmer sway now this way, now that; the temptation, the pressure to renounce the ancient Catholic system, was at times tremendous. But the Church does not yield to it: she comes forth from the first stage of the Reformation, purified from many superstitions, though at a price, for she is for the time weakened and robbed of much that was and is rightfully her own.

She has lost, for instance, to a great extent, the power to manage her own affairs, and the religious life, in the technical sense, has ceased to exist within her borders. Those are marks of the violence of the storm. But the Catholic inheritance has been preserved intact, the Creeds, the Sacraments, and the Apostolic Ministry, and no one who believes in historical Christianity can fail to see in that fact the work of the Holy Spirit of God. Further, she has in her hands a key which may one day unlock the barriers which separate the severed bodies of baptized Christians from one another; that key is her appeal to the authority of Scripture and the Fathers.

But there is to be a resolute attack upon the Catholic inheritance she has preserved—that is, the second stage of the Reformation period—and the anti-Catholic forces seem more than once to be carrying all before them. Just when the Universities, and therefore the majority of the clergy, towards

* Heb. xii. 27. † Neh. ii. 8.

the end of Elizabeth's reign are apparently Calvinist, there are raised up in succession Richard Hooker, Lancelot Andrewes, and then Archbishop William Laud. The threatened danger is averted, but it does not look like it when, in 1645, Archbishop Laud dies on the scaffold and the Prayer Book is proscribed, the churches defaced, and the bishops are in prison or in exile. It looked then as if the English Church had perished: for there is only one place in Europe, in the world, in which her offices and liturgy can be recited publicly with any sort of splendour—and that is in the chapel of an English nobleman, Sir Richard Browne, in Paris. But the Hand which has guided the Church through so many perils has not left her now. The Puritan rule collapses, the Church returns to her cathedral and parish churches, and the stormy period of the Reformation closes in 1662 with the Prayer Book as we have it to-day.

But the dangers are not over: they have only changed their form. The next generation sees the exclusion of some of the most devoted and learned of Churchmen, bishops, priests, and layfolk whose consciences are too tender to break oaths they have most solemnly taken. These men became Non-Jurors, and they and their descendants endured poverty and persecution for a hundred years, until under altered circumstances they return to the Church. But even in their poverty and obloquy they keep alive—even more, they proclaim—the Catholic ideals. And a book of one of them, the *Serious Call* of William Law, is greatly responsible for the next great revival of religion, that of the Methodists. The loss of the Non-Jurors was almost the most serious blow the Church has suffered. It left the way open for men like Sir Robert Walpole, men on principle irreligious, who desired to reduce the Church to comparative impotence. The Convocations are suspended, the plan for giving bishops to America is scrapped, the bishops and priests in Scotland driven from their sees and parishes in 1690 were almost crushed out, after 1745, by a savage penal code; and as for missionary work, part of what foreign missionary work is done in India (that in the Madras Presidency) is conducted by Lutheran pastors, subsidized by the S.P.C.K. A blight of lethargy settles down.

Yet it is in that dreary time that there is raised up one of the Church's deepest thinkers, Bishop Butler, and those greatest of her Evangelists, John and Charles Wesley, and that staunchest of her laymen, Samuel Johnson.

But Bishop Butler closes his career with misgivings for the future, refusing the Archbishopric of Canterbury, because it is "too late to try to support a falling Church," and the Methodist movement, strictly so-called, mishandled and misunderstood,

results, partly, in a separation from the Church. So that at the end of the eighteenth century the spiritual life of the English Church appears to be confined to two relatively small groups: first, the Evangelicals, who are in part a product of the revival of the Wesleys; and, second, a still smaller band who cling persistently, but rather timidly, to the Catholic teaching of the Church and the Sacraments. The flame of that teaching had burnt so low that at the beginning of the nineteenth century the great Church society, the S.P.C.K., had taken to printing the Order for Holy Communion (in the Prayer Books it circulated), in small print like the rest of the occasional offices, and the level of sacramental life is shown by the fact that in the year 1800, on Easter Day, in St. Paul's Cathedral, there was but one celebration of the Holy Communion, and only four communicants were present at it. As the nineteenth century proceeded the prospect grew darker. The Evangelicals had done noble work by their enthusiasm for foreign missions, by their philanthropic zeal, which was reforming the prisons and they had abolished the slave trade. But the movement had not touched the multitudes of Englishmen who, under the factory system, were little better than heathen and slaves. The High Churchmen had laboured to educate the poor and to build new churches, but the High Churchmen, like the Evangelicals, had not touched the hearts of the mass of the Church, still less of the mass of the nation. When the era of Reform began in 1830 the Church seemed dying, if not dead, and the only things left to be done for her were to arrange for her funeral and divide her spoils. In June, 1832—only ninety years ago—one of the foremost men of England at that day—the famous Headmaster of Rugby—Dr. Arnold, declared that "the Church as it now stands no human power can save,"* and most observers, there is little doubt, would have entirely agreed with him.

No human power did save the Church. Once again, as in the tenth century, as in the eleventh, as in the critical periods of the Reformation, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, you see, though perhaps on a more startling scale than ever, what Nehemiah calls "the good hand of my God upon" her.

A little group of dons at Oxford, scholars, men of genius, earnestly religious, recall Englishmen to the meaning of the part of the Faith they have forgotten. They proclaim the old truths embedded in the Prayer Book, but neglected in practice at that day: the meaning of Churchmanship, the Church as a Divine Society, and of the Sacraments as the appointed means of contact with the Lord. They recall men to the super-

* Stanley's *Life of Dr. Arnold*, i. 326.

natural side of religion. Their appeal is first of all to the educated, for it begins in a University, but it passes out into the streets and lanes of the cities.

It arouses passionate hostility, first of all in the University in which it began. Its call to a severer standard of life was naturally disagreeable to the worldly, but it is not only the worldly who oppose it. It cuts directly across prejudices dear to the British public of that day, and very soon the cry of Popery is raised. Roman Catholics and ultra-Protestants, from different points of view, join in attacking it and ascribe its origin to the devil; and its members are soon fighting for their lives in the English Church. After twelve years the Movement is defeated in Oxford: its most prominent leader, Mr. Newman, loses his faith in the English Church and goes to Rome, and a brilliant group of his disciples, some of whom have for some time made Rome their ideal, follow him.

The blow to public confidence in the Movement is tremendous, for its enemies point triumphantly to the truth of what they had foretold. But this stricken Movement refuses to die. With all the powers of the English world against it, the Court, the men in authority in Church and State, the Press, and the ordinary man who is swayed by the Press, the revival goes on; it holds its ground; it does more, it spreads.

A fresh batch of secessions to Rome—after the decisions of the Privy Council in the Gorham case, seventy years ago—gives what looks like a fatal blow, for among those who go is one of the few officials who have joined the Revival, and who largely speaks for it to the public. He is Henry Edward Manning, a great public man, who began life as an Evangelical and was now the Archdeacon of Chichester.

Yet still the Movement continues. Its leaders, Dr. Pusey and John Keble, remain unshaken. But for the rest of their lives they are "men wondered at." Their great colleague, Dr. Newman, after many difficulties as a Roman Catholic, is recognized and honoured at last; he is created a Cardinal—but in their lifetime neither Mr. Keble nor Dr. Pusey receive a single mark of honour in the English Church. Yet, before Dr. Pusey dies in 1882—forty years ago—he has seen a change pass over the Church of England, of which he no more than Dr. Arnold would have dreamed in 1832. What that change was it is perhaps most easy to see by looking at a few scenes, and I put the most important first.

Ninety years ago there was not a single "religious house" in the Church of England.

If an English man or an English woman felt the call of God to serve Him in a religious community, there was no chance

whatever of realizing it, for the very simple reason that, though England and Wales were rich in monastic ruins, there was no such thing through all the length and breadth of the English Church as a single religious house. That was ninety years ago. Look at these pictures:

It is the morning of Trinity Sunday, June 5, 1841. The place is St. Mary's, Oxford, better known as the University Church. The Holy Communion is being celebrated. The ceremonial would surprise some to-day, for the Vicar, Mr. Newman, is vested simply in surplice and hood, and he stands at the north end of the altar. The altar has neither cross nor flowers on it. Among the communicants, at the altar rail, kneels a young lady, dressed in white, wearing an ivory cross. She is the daughter of an Oxfordshire priest; her name is Marian Rebecca Hughes, and she is dedicating herself to the religious life.* Some years elapsed before she could enter a community, but from that day forward she lives as a religious—under vows.

Pass on sixteen years. It is November, 1857, in the dusk of the late afternoon. We are standing in a crowded churchyard at Lewes; a funeral is just over; it is the funeral of a Sister of St. Margaret's, East Grinstead, a community founded two years before. The Sister has died from nursing a bad case of scarlet fever. Round the grave are the Sisters of St. Margaret's with their Warden, Dr. John Mason Neale. He is the priest who has said the service. Suddenly a signal is given, lights are put out or flashed in the faces of the Sisters, and a rush is made at them by the mob. The Warden is knocked down, and the rest of the band, hustled and insulted, are swept along by the crowd, until at last the police contrive to get some of them into a schoolmaster's house and others into an inn. It is through fierce and hostile crowds that the little party is at last got by the police to the railway station to catch their train home.†

Look on fifty-five years later. It is May, 1912, in Oxford. On one of the finest sites on the north of the city there is a noble group of grey stone buildings, with a chapel, whose beautiful outlines catch the eye of every passer by. It is the Convent of the Holy and Undivided Trinity. Within it there is sadness, for its Mother Superior is dying. Frail now, and very aged, she is the same lady who, seventy-one years before, knelt at the altar of St. Mary's that Trinity Sunday morning. She was then the only religious professed in the Church of England. As she closes her long life there she can look over the Church of England, and know that there are at least (and it is a very

* *Life of Dr. Pusey*, iii. 10.
† *Memoirs of Dr. J. M. Neale*, by E. A. Towle, pp. 266, 267.

incomplete reckoning) 1,300 professed Sisters in the Church of England—nearly twice as many as there were when the religious houses were suppressed by Henry VIII.*

Christendom has seen some amazing revivals, but I believe that the revival of the religious life in England in these last eighty years is without parallel in the history of the Church in the East or in the West.

Or, take another set: the revival of the ordered worship of Almighty God is a part of this revival. A hundred years ago popular religion was concerning itself very largely with the feelings of the individual. People went to Church to get something, but the Anglo-Catholic revival puts the worship of God and the honour due to His Name in the front rank, and its followers go to Church to give, not to get. In 1830 the cathedrals and parish churches of England and of Wales were in an unbelievable state of neglect and disrepair. A young man, later to become a famous Church architect, William Butterfield, spent some years at that time in travelling over England, noting the ancient buildings of the country, especially the churches. He said in later life: "Few living persons can at all realize the appearance they then everywhere presented":† the fabrics were often ruinous, the fittings were cheap and hideous, the buildings, unused on week-days, reeked of mould and damp on Sundays. The worship offered was on a like scale. The offices said on Sunday were often a monotone between the parson and the clerk; hymn-singing as we know it was almost entirely confined then to the Methodists; the Holy Communion was celebrated, as a rule, once a quarter, and by no means always then. That was the type of the country church. The cathedrals were little better.

I have referred already to St. Paul's Cathedral with its one celebration and four communicants on Easter Day, 1800.

Look at it in 1868. The services are held in the choir behind a thick screen. Six or eight boys, and two, three, or four men, as chance orders it, form the choir; these, with the Minor Canons and the one member of the Chapter present, meet at the opening of the choir. No voluntary is played as the clergy and choir enter the church, and late comers straggle in as they will; the choir men read letters and talk during the service; as for the congregation, sometimes on a Sunday morning not a single worshipper is present. Nominally there is a celebration of the Holy Communion on Sundays, but mark this. It is Sunday, and a young man is kneeling in the

* The figures are from tables printed in Bishop H. R. Weller's *Religious Orders in the Anglican Communion* (Milwaukee, 1909), appendix ii.

† From an autobiographical note in Mr. W. D. Caroe's Memoir of William Butterfield in the *Journal of the Royal Institute of British Architects*, 1900, p. 241.

cathedral, intending to receive the Sacrament. A verger comes to him and says, "I hope, sir, you are not intending to remain for the Sacrament, as that will give the Minor Canon the trouble of celebrating, which otherwise he will not do." The young man gets up and goes out of the cathedral. His name is Frederick Temple, and he is later to be Bishop of Exeter, and finally Archbishop of Canterbury.*

There are other pictures, some of them absurd.

The year is about 1850, and a meeting of parishioners is being held in a Berkshire parish. The squire is making a speech. He makes a pathetic allusion to his aunt who attained the age of 100 years. He says that it is a great satisfaction to his brother and to himself that the latter days of their excellent aunt were not embittered by such proceedings as had lately taken place in the parish, and that she had not lived to be driven . . . from the church which she had so many years attended. Let Dr. MacColl complete the narrative: "The fate from which the Angel of Death had so mercifully snatched this good old lady was that of witnessing the collection of an offertory and hearing the Church Militant prayer on Sundays on which the Holy Communion was not celebrated."†

Here is another picture. It is nine years later, 1859, and the scene is a few miles east of St. Paul's. It is a heavy Georgian church, standing in the slums of Wapping and Shadwell. For some years past it has had a Tractarian Rector, and he has lately been assisted by a band of clergy working in a mission church by the London Docks. Their work has been successful, and the owners of the dens of vice with which that part abounded are indignant at the change. The services of the parish church have been made more reverent: Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany are chanted now on Sundays, there is a choir which sits in the chancel, the Sanctuary is hung with tapestry, on the altar is a cross. Further, linen vestments are used at the Holy Communion, and coloured stoles are worn.

These changes, it is said, are Popish, and for ten months the Church is given over to a howling mob. At the Bishop's bidding the vestments are disused, but the riots continue. Then the Bishop (Dr. Tait) believes that the turning to the east by the clergy in the pulpit at the end of the sermon is the cause of the fierce feeling, and he requests it to be dropped. It is of no avail; a violent and blaspheming mob take possession of the church, shout songs during the lessons and the sermon, hurl books and hassocks at the altar, hustle the choir boys, spit upon and kick the clergy. Finally, the Rector is forced

* *Autobiography of Dean Gregory*, pp. 160, 164, 165.

† *The Reformation Settlement*, by Dr. MacColl (3rd edition revised, 1899), p. lxx

to resign, and the mob wins the day.* Now look at the same district twenty years later. It is a week-day, but the streets are densely crowded with men, women and children. A coffin is being borne along—with cross and surpliced choir before it, and a throng of vested clergy followed by Sisters of Mercy behind. A long special train is waiting to take 600 of the people to see that coffin laid in its grave; hundreds who cannot afford the fare will go on foot. It is reckoned that 3,000 people are in Chislehurst churchyard when the last words are said. That is the burial of Charles Lowder, one of the priests pelted, hustled, very nearly thrown into the dock, in the riots twenty years before.† But he has never flinched; he has lived and died for his folk in East London, and though it is near forty years ago since he died, if you go to St. Peter's London Docks any 9th of September, the little children in the streets will tell you it is Father Lowder's day.

The revival meant more than the restoration of worship. It meant the revival of Church discipline, and especially that of Sacramental confession. Look at this picture: The scene is a room in the Royal Hotel at Plymouth. It is September, 1852. The Bishop of Exeter is there with his chaplains, and the Archdeacon and many local clergy. Before them stands a young priest, accused of forcing young girls to make their confessions to him, and asking them improper questions. He is the Vicar of St. Peter's, Plymouth. Hour after hour the inquiry goes on, one by one the charges break down, until at last the end comes. The Bishop says: "I exonerate Mr. Prynne from any blame in this matter, and I acquit him even of indiscretion, and I pray God that every clergyman in my diocese may do his duty as well as Mr. Prynne has done his."‡

Take another. It is 1858. *The Times* newspaper has appeared with a leading article, *What is Auricular Confession?* The article refers to charges, similar to those against Mr. Prynne, made against a curate in the diocese of Oxford. It sums up the statements and concludes, "as far as the statements clash, we believe the women and disbelieve the curate." The Bishop of Oxford issues a commission of inquiry. It meets at ten o'clock in the morning, and ends at half-past nine at night. A distinguished judge, Sir Robert Phillimore, presides over it. The young priest accused gives his evidence, the statements of the accusers break down. The court gives a verdict completely exculpating the curate. The mother

* See the story in the present writer's *Short History of the Oxford Movement*, pp. 188-190, with the references there.

† See *Charles Lowder*, pp. 358-360.

‡ *George Rundle Prynne*, by Clifton Kelway, p. 91.

of the accused priest is in court, and as she leaves it on her son's arm a bystander says, "That's his mother." She draws herself up and exclaims: "Yes, and proud to be." She was Lady Maria West, and that young priest was to be one of the most trusted London clergy of his generation, the founder and first Vicar of St. Mary Magdalene's, Paddington, Richard Temple West.*

It would be easy to add picture to picture. Let me show you only two more. It is 1859. See a young priest, with a brilliant reputation, leaving in deep sadness one of the very few Theological Colleges then existing in England. He has been its Vice-Principal for five years, and his influence on the students has been profound. But Protestant pressure is strong, and the Bishop feels it necessary to get rid of the too successful Vice-Principal. The college is Cuddesdon, and the name of the priest is Henry Parry Liddon.†

Look on twenty-five years: this young man so dismissed is now a Canon of St. Paul's, and drawing vast crowds to the cathedral by the eloquence and the spiritual force of his preaching, and a close and keen observer—no less an one than Lord Acton—is writing to the daughter of the Prime Minister of the day: "Assuredly Liddon is the greatest power in the conflict with sin, and in turning the souls of men to God, that the nation now possesses."‡

Take one more. It is 1862: a young man touched by the fire of the Catholic revival, is eager to give himself to save souls in the neglected part of central London. He is having a preliminary interview with the Bishop of London, Dr. Tait. The young man's name is Arthur Henry Stanton. The Bishop speaks to him quite frankly and kindly: "If you go to Machonochie (of St. Alban's, Holborn), you must never expect any Church preferment."§

Look on forty-five years. It is 1907, and the Bishop's words have come true: Stanton has had no Church preferment. He is still an assistant curate at the church to which he went in 1862. Instead of preferment he has had stern rebuke. Bishop after Bishop, thirty years before, has inhibited him from preaching in his diocese—indeed, it was reserved for a Bishop of the Northern Province to inhibit him, or practically to inhibit him, from preaching in his diocese scarcely a year before his death. But look at 1907. We are in Holborn, the floor of the Town Hall is crowded by close on 800 men, the galleries are filled with women, the platform is crowded with a representative group which includes an eminent Non-

* *Richard Temple West*, by T. T. Carter, pp. 28, 29.
† See *Dr. Liddon*, by G. W. E. Russell, pp. 11, 12.
‡ *Letters of Lod Acton to Mary Gladstone*, p. 202.
§ *Arthur Stanton*, by G. W. E. Russell, p. 264.

conformist minister. What are they there for? They are there to thank this man for the gifts which God has given them through him; for his unwavering witness through forty-five years to the truths of the Catholic Faith as witnessed to us in the English Church.*

There are other pictures. Let me give you one which you can draw for yourselves. I hold in my hand a postcard. It was written from Lancaster gaol on March 28, 1881. It is signed by Sidney Faithorne Green.†

I know that these pictures do faint justice to the work which the revival has done. But they show a part of it. And, thank God, it is not over, it is alive still. Only as you work for it and pray for it, remember these men who fought the fight in the generations gone by. Remember the weapons with which they fought; and, above all, remember the spirit in which they fought. Don't despise, don't sneer at the Tractarians. They were reserved, austere, very hard with themselves; they were scrupulous about their obedience to the English Church, its officers and its formularies; they cared nothing for place or power or popularity; they lived out their lives, most of them, suspected, neglected, misunderstood. But they preserved under that long trial their patience, their faith, and their good temper. They laboured abundantly in their studies and in their parishes, and we have entered into their labours. A later generation tends to despise its immediate predecessors; it has little use for old-fashioned ways and methods that are not exactly up to date. I pray God that the followers of the Catholic revival in England will never lose sight or lose touch with that austere unworldliness, that shrinking from unreality and display, which marked the leaders and the rank and file of the first generations of the Catholic revival. For it was this moral beauty of their lives which convinced Englishmen, even against their will, that the revival was a work of God.

Time fails me to mention many for whose great names we ought to thank God: for Dean Church, for William Bright, for Edward King, Bishop of Lincoln, for William Ewart Gladstone, for Alexander Heriot Machonochie and Robert Dolling, for Aubrey Moore and Henry Scott Holland. And there are Frederick Denison Maurice and Bishop Westcott and Bishop Lightfoot, who were not of the group whose work I have emphasized. To them is due no small part of the revival of the

* *Op. cit.*, p. 262.

† The Rev. S. F. Green, Rector of St. John's, Miles Platting, Manchester, was imprisoned in Lancaster prison from March 19, 1881, until November, 1882, for refusal to obey the judgment of Lord Penzance's court. See Baring Gould's *The Church Revival* (1914), pp. 245-249.

energies of the Church of England. There have been "diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." And there are honoured names of a very different school, foremost among them that of Anthony, seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, who consecrated sixty years of active life to the cause of the poor and helpless.

This point only I desire to emphasize. These men of the revival of which I have spoken "all died in faith"—in faith that the good hand of God the Holy Spirit rests upon and guides us in the Church of England; and this revived Church life, these changes in the standard of worship, of devotion, and of practice which would have seemed utterly incredible in 1822, are due under God chiefly to this once bitterly hated and despised band, who in the face of popular opinion trusted, and trusted wholly, not to political might nor to intellectual power, but to the leading of the Holy Spirit of God.

S. L. OLLARD.

OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO THE NATION*

I BEGIN my paper by saying that I am not dealing in it with the primary duty which lies upon us in regard to the members of the English nation—*i.e.*, the personal evangelization of our fellow-countrymen, so as to lead each one whom we can reach to experience a change of mind and heart, to loyal acceptance of Jesus as Saviour and Lord, and of the Catholic Faith as the fullest expression of His Revelation of Himself to mankind.

In all the Congresses this aim has been, and will be, fully brought before those who attend. It underlies all our work, and is, in regard to every paper, as the all-powerful motif continually recurring in a musical composition.

My object is, in the space allowed me, while insisting at the start on the necessity of the strictly spiritual side of our subject, to direct your attention to the necessity, if we would preach a full Gospel—one truly Catholic, and therefore adequate and complete—of showing practically that our spiritual message involves a social content. The necessity lies upon us of so exhibiting that message in our teaching, and still more in our lives, that it is seen not only to have a reference to individuals considered separately, but also to the life of the nation, and, in the case of the whole Catholic Church, to humanity at large. We must not content ourselves with treating individuals as isolated atoms, since the Catholic attitude to life is in its true

* Paper read at Anglo-Catholic Congress at Norwich, 1922, by Rev. Charles Edward Osborne, Rector of Wallsend and Hon. Canon of Newcastle.

ideal one of respect for individuality, but of rejection of individualism. In Catholic sociology, as in Pauline theology, the individual and society are correlative terms, and the human race is not viewed as a concurrence of individualities, each self-sufficient, but as an organic growth with a collective life, a life in which the body nourishes the members, and the members in turn minister to the well-being of the body.

"No man liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself."

So far, by way of introduction.

There is, it seems to me, a certain strong reason why we, as Anglo-Catholics, should be active and intelligent citizens sharing in the national life and promoting its highest type of progress. It is because we have to assert so strongly the truth of the inherent right of the Church to spiritual independence in regard to the modern State—a State now no longer composed exclusively of Christians or even of Theists. For, as Erastianism is one of our worst enemies, we are, and will always be, stubborn and impenitent resisters to its view of life. Erastianism is still a foe and by no means dead, and still has at least one able logical representative on the Episcopal bench, and a potent ally in the untheological temper of the English mind. Puritanism, on the other hand, is practically bankrupt, though what we may call the higher Puritanism will always be an essential element in Catholic Christianity.

It is one of the chief glories of the Oxford Movement to have rediscovered the spiritual rights and duties of the Church as having their fount and great original on the Mount of the Ascension and in the Upper Room of Pentecost, rather than in the Council Chamber of the State. To reassert this we may have to undo much of the tangle of Tudor Church legislation, as the Tudors undid that of the Papal control. Yet we Catholics must beware of forgetting that, within its own temporal sphere, the State is a divine organism for its own purposes, as, in the spiritual and supernatural sphere, the Church is for hers. A healthy interaction of Church and Commonwealth, neither seeking to subserve the other as a department of its own life, is the true ideal, although it is admittedly difficult of realization. In the past the powers of the Sword and of the Keys respectively have been generally confused with disastrous consequences on both sides. The natural order comes from God as well as the supernatural, and though the latter is the higher, yet neither must be set against the other in a kind of Manichean dualism.

Here, St. Thomas Aquinas and Dante are at one with F. D. Maurice, with Bishop Westcott, and with that greatest of living Catholic philosophers (happily still living), Baron Friedrich von Hügel.

The twofold task that the best minds in thought and religion are called to grapple with to-day is, as has been well said, the effort to "naturalize the supernatural, and to supernaturalize the natural." God is not opposed to what is human, but to what is sinful.

The life of man, as a whole, in all its departments and not only any sectional part of it, comes from God, and bears, though often amid unspeakable degradation, the impress of the Divine Hand.

The pre-eminence of spirit in the hierarchy of our being is not to be regarded as expressing the upward effort of an imprisoned force seeking to extricate itself from an alien environment. This is the Neo-Platonic conception, not that of the Catholic Faith. In the view of the latter, matter and spirit, body and soul, Society and the Individual, are correlative, not contradictory, to each other respectively. Every part of our nature is to be re-won for God. No part is in itself vile, however capable of perversion.

The age on which the world is entering ought to see us as Christians putting forth a social ethic which is at once old in essence, but new in vivid apprehension and practical application, the ethic of the New Commandment, first to the Church, then to Humanity through the Church—"Love one another, for love is of God." The ethical and theological are never separated in the New Testament. They are coherent with one another. So St. Paul's claim of all life for Christ, as the Lord of Life and the Recapitulation of Humanity, has its splendid significance for national and international existence. The message of a Catholicism that is responsive to this will not fall on deaf ears. It will awaken an echo in many hearts and minds. It has had its mighty forerunners in the past, and will be more at home in spirit with Dante and St. Thomas than with the later Spanish Romanist Reaction, with Erasmus and Colet than with the Counter-Reformation, in spite of the spiritual keenness of Ignatius and his sons.

Our Anglo-Catholic propaganda, to be really sound and fruitful, must proceed in relation to social questions on some such lines as the above, even while there must be also, and in the supreme place, a full recognition of the need of realizing the sternness of the solitary combat, the wrestling in the night watches of the spirit alone, yet not alone, the straitness of the gate by which the pilgrim soul must enter, the narrowness of the way along which it must tread. Solitude and Fellowship are the twin forces of noble living—the two poles between which our life revolves. Like Christ, we must have our feet on the heights and our heart with the crowd. The spiritual

and the social involve one another. Rightly understood, the claims of the individual and of the community are complementary, not antagonistic. In reality, neither the individual nor the community can develop their nature respectively without regard to the well-being of the other. The individual can only be really free through association. The community can only grow through initiative.

Catholic Christianity contains in itself, at one and the same time, both the principles which have given, at one period or another, vitality and attractiveness to individualism and to socialism respectively. "What shall a man give in exchange for his soul?" "Ye are the Body of Christ." Both sayings are true.

We must, as Catholics with modern minds, be men of our time. We must present a way of life richer and fuller than that involved in the predominantly individual-regarding ethics, since the Reformation, of both the main types of religion alike, of religious Protestantism, especially in its most sentimental form, and of Roman piety as moulded by the Jesuits. Religious individualism, of both types, has been, even allowing for its genuine merits alike among Protestants and among Catholics, something narrower, less "European, august, imaginative," less in the broad stream of life and history than was mediæval Christianity, in spite of the latter's many imperfections. But we cannot merely sigh for the vanished glories, the lost enchantments of the Middle Age. We must again, under better conditions than those possible in the mediæval period, present our Master's religion as the light illuminating a *Civitas Dei*, the City of God, and not only the gleam which guides the individual soul. It is that, but it is more. The forgetfulness of this has led in the past to diverse mistaken courses (all disastrous to the best interests of religion), to the inhumanity of Puritanism, to the reduction of Ultramontanism to a "religion of the Sacristy," and in regard to the Anglican Communion, to inability of the latter to touch or understand the multitude, and to her presentation of herself as what a scornful critic once called her "the most ladylike of the Churches"—timid, remote from life, and incapable of that audacity in grasping opportunities which is the truest wisdom.

I have often thought that for a religiously self-centred penitent, a wholesome penance would be to read for a short time daily some fair-minded and well-informed newspaper as a step towards bringing the motives of the Christian Life to bear upon the purification and renewal of the world. Our newspaper reading and our intercessions would then start with a healthy connection. We would have the world in our heart.

In our Bible reading we need, as so many are finding to their great advantage, spiritually and practically, to rediscover the Old Testament Prophets. Their message read in the new light which historical scholarship and experience of life throws upon it may be fairly considered, as if the re-opening of the Prophets, regarded as forthtellers and therefore, and only therefore, as foretellers, was a new spring of virility of spirit, of courage and hope, amid the baffling problems of the world. The Judaic element in the Bible, so sturdily at home with history, so vigorous amid the flux of the phenomena of time—this Judaic temper with its onward thrust and forward look—is, after all, more essential to Christianity than the timeless and will-less knowing of the Neo-Platonic school.

Owing to the fact that in the New Testament period the human life of the countries around the Mediterranean, with the partial exception of Judæa, had been pooled into the vast reservoir of the Græco-Roman world, there were no nations for religion to concern itself with. Also, the sense of the Parousia of the returning Christ, as of something quivering behind the veil of time, and ready to break through at any moment—while giving an indescribable degree of keenness and alertness to the spirit of the expectant Church—could not, by the nature of the case, be immediately conducive to the recognition of national life as a true sphere of the divine Kingdom and plan. How could men realize as a part of the Kingdom, however preliminary and imperfect, principles of good citizenship and social progress, when the whole civilized world appeared as the scroll of the prophets' vision, ready to shrivel up in the flame of the divine Apocalypse, like autumn leaves amid the fire? Yet, eschatological as the Gospels are, the principles of Christian citizenship are in a wonderful manner latent in many of the parables of Christ, the sanity and restraint of which are as remarkable as their profound depths of spiritual power. In them buying and selling, family life, social conditions generally are illuminated by the penetrating light of the revelation of the righteousness and of the love of God as supremely operative in the social existence of Humanity. If, on the one hand, Christ refuses to bid a man divide the inheritance with his brother, yet, on the other, He utters the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, with its indirect yet scathing condemnation of selfish inequality of condition, and drives the money-changers out of the Temple, without waiting to consider if He was violating an economic law or encouraging a revolutionary spirit. Among the Apostolic writers St. Paul recognizes the Roman Empire as, on its good side, ordained by God. In all that Rome has meant to the

world there is a strange mixture of good and evil, of divine Providence and human pride. St. Paul sees the former, the author of the Apocalypse the latter.

It is not, however, until we arrive at the mediæval period, in the great thirteenth century, when Christianity, in one place or another, displayed at once, as has been said, every virtue except moderation, and every vice except vulgarity, that we perceive, partly by means of a sort of instinct and atmosphere, partly as articulately expressed in a reasoned philosophy of life, as that of St. Thomas, in which Aristotelian thought and Christian Faith were fused together, the attempt to bring all human conditions, social as well as individual, under the Christian Law as the Church then understood it.

In spite of the faults of the Holy Roman Empire of the Middle Ages, or of the Roman Papacy, they witnessed alike, the latter in a much more actual and realistic manner than the former, to the coherence of human life. "Christendom" is a word which once stood for a concrete and solid reality, even if the attempt to save this from disintegration involved the policy of religious persecution. "At the Reformation," writes Mr. G. K. Chesterton, "England ceased to be a Christian nation and became a chosen people." Our modern British Imperialism is but the extension of Anglo-Saxon ideals and modes of life and government over a large section of the world. It has been in the main attended with real success, in spite of seriously disquieting symptoms in one quarter or another. Its common sense has, on the whole and up to the present, saved it from the fate of more pretentious and militarist imperialisms. But it is not internationalism, nor can it of itself supply the need of an international fellowship.

In regard to this subject it has been truly said that a league of Churches is the essential corollary and support of the League of Nations. But Christian Reunion, to be effectual, must not be merely a universal interchange of pulpits among the communions of British Protestantism. It must witness for Christianity as binding together diverse races and nations, and not as the property of one alone. The sneer of Voltaire that the English believe that the Incarnation took place for the special benefit of the Anglo-Saxon race is not wholly without justification. It is the ideal of a truly Catholic Church to be not merely the chaplain blessing a patriotic banner, but to be like the seers of Israel—a prophet to the nations. "I have made thee as My mouth." But prophecy and martyrdom stand not far apart in history and in life. The Union Jack stirs, and rightly stirs, much honest patriotic enthusiasm, but as Christians the Crucifix and not the Union Jack is our

ultimate symbol. The realization of this, in relation to the present reign of hate among the nations and of distrust among classes, involves something more of vocation, and of a message to Humanity of a greater degree of moral depth and grandeur than is exhibited under present conditions by the existing Roman, or Eastern, or Anglican Communions, or by any other group of Christians. Voices are heard in the wilderness, yet we still wait for some apocalypse of Christianity greater than we see at present, of a Christianity less sectional and self-centred, more widely human and more deeply divine.

To apply what I have said to the virtue of *patriotism*—which we may still, I think, call a virtue, in spite of Lord Hugh Cecil's true consciousness of the havoc which its perversion has wrought—a virtue so dear, especially to the English mind and English sentiment, and yet so capable of slipping down to become something mentally vulgar and fundamentally immoral, expressing itself in the immoral maxim, which yet seems so obviously natural: "My country, right or wrong." The Catholic way of regarding this question of patriotism will steer between the Scylla of racial insularity and contempt of the foreigner and the Charybdis of the vague cosmopolitanism of the sentimentalist or the crank, types of individuals more offensive, I think, even than the jingo.

The rediscovery of the true nature of national life from the attitude of the Hebrew Prophets, to which I have alluded already, is associated, above all among modern religious thinkers, with the name of Frederic Denison Maurice, himself with a true measure of the prophetic gift, the power of seeing into life and of forthseeing its issues.

Yet the ardent discipleship of that noble Englishman Charles Kingsley towards his master Frederic Maurice was not altogether of a wise type. If Kingsley popularized the Maurician message as to the social question in his novel of *Alton Locke*, he coarsened and narrowed Maurice's recognition of the divine force in nationality in the fierce Elizabethan Protestantism of *Westward Ho*. The patriotic spirit of Kingsley is liable in the hands of lesser men than himself to degenerate into the cult of a tribal God, and the universality of the Church, into which the nations bring their glory, to shrink into something that is the religion of English society, reflecting the mind of the latter rather than Christ's revelation.

In the writings of Kipling we see patriotism at its best in the immortal Recessional, but, I fear I must add, very nearly at its worst in other expressions of the mind of that writer of an inspiration at once so genuine and so limited, so untouched by the wider spiritual and international issues. Is

it unjust to apply to him Matthew Arnold's epithet: "A Philistine with genius"?

No Catholic Churchman can rest with satisfaction in the mentality congenial to the influence of Kipling. The Church of England has a loftier function than that of the Chaplain of Empire. The Church has to cultivate in the British people a mentality human, Christian, and in the best sense Catholic. She has to teach the English race to use its undoubtedly splendid gifts for the service of a higher civilization than that which ought to have ended with the War. She has not to encourage, but to counteract, the arrogance of national prejudice and the belief in the inherent racial privileges of the Anglo-Saxon breed.

We need to realize that it takes men of all kinds to make a world. We need, what we have not yet got, a type of national mind which yields to the ideals of the League of Nations something better than the compliments of an empty lip service.

We are learning as Catholics that sooner or later the Apostolic conception of the Church's divine mission must come into collision with the tone of mind of those who, at the period when the Oxford Movement began to disturb the peace of the Establishment, were fond of lauding the Church of England, as she then was, in such terms as "the brightest jewel of Queen Victoria's crown." Such persons were described, I think by Newman, as those whose ideal of the extension of Christianity is to "plant the vicarage, and to run the pony-carriage over the entire surface of the *orbis terrarum*." Such are the persons who seem to consider that the Ecclesia Anglicana has a peculiar mission to acclimatize Mattins at eleven among the Alpine heights. But the true international outlook is even wider than ecclesiastical interests and affairs. It is a way of regarding human life which, when not merely the result of affectation, is in itself an instrument and expression of civilization and culture as distinct from Philistinism, and of Christ's mind as distinct from that of the natural man.

Among the first of the great principles which should underlie the spiritual and moral attitude of the Church towards national and social life is the truth, which I already have dealt with, that there is nothing in human existence so gross in itself that it is incapable of spiritualization, of receiving into its being and operation the cleansing salt of the Gospel. Hence national life is a congenial material for the leavening power of Christianity.

Nor need Catholic Christianity find in the modern State something merely secular and antagonistic. Sacramentalism,

when also ethical, and democracy, when also sane, touch on one another at many points—a sacramentalism, that is, which claims common things and common life for God, and a democracy which finds that the motives needed for the energy and unselfishness of reconstruction can only come from a religion to which nothing human is remote.

In regard to commercial life, there is a splendid Christian principle the application of which contains in itself a force at once spiritually and socially explosive. It is that which regards persons and not things, men and not money, as the most important factors in the life of any community which grows on Christ's plan. We hear of commercial companies employing in their factories so many thousand "hands." In the lovely early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, so akin in their sense of simplicity and of joyous adventure to the Franciscan Fioretti, we read that the Lord added unto them so many thousand "souls." "Hands" there, "souls" here, the contrast in terminology is in accord in each case with the appropriate environment—the regarding of man, his limbs and muscle and brain, as a purchasable commodity in the one case, and the conception of him as a living being that thinks and feels, finding his completion in loving association with his fellows, in the other. For the first Christians, before Mammon had laid upon the Church his heavy patronizing paw, the sacrament was not a sort of outlying survival, a reminiscence in an alien environment. It was the significant focus of an existence that was entirely sacramental. Every supper was a Lord's Supper, a meal of fraternity which the Elder Brother shared with His brethren. That the purest joy wells up from the spirit of sacrifice and the temper of sharing, this was the discovery of the first disciples. "They did eat their food with gladness and singleness of heart." With singleness of heart, for artificiality and unreality are the foes of joy, as greed is the enemy of peace. This is the kind of atmosphere which the Gospel, when socially applied, can create, and without this, so intangible and yet so essential, no merely political reconstruction in England or anywhere else is of much lasting avail. The essence of Christianity is the supremacy of love, and Catholicism, to be worth anything, must be a propaganda of love, an organism vibrating with love alike to God and to man. Love is the root virtue of the Church, as Justice is of the State. Without love the Church becomes hardened into ecclesiasticism, or breaks up into sectarian fragments. Love at once unites and liberates. The application of this spirit to human life is one of the noblest tasks to the accomplishment of which we are called to-day, and we are only at the beginning

of the work of this divine adventure. Christianity is a very new religion, as well as a very old one.

The splendid sweep of the propaganda of which the sacred Heart of Jesus is the source, the swing of its advance, cannot be stopped short at some imaginary point where individuality ends and social life begins. Both are necessarily within its range. In the Mystery of the Eucharist, the divine victim is shared among the Community, and becomes their collective life. The Mass is fundamentally a social action. Yet Communion does not destroy individuality. Neither *laissez-faire* nor Marxian Communism, as in Russia to day, with its coercive monotony, are just or adequate solutions of the tangled social problem. The economic factor is not the sole one in life.

A living man is not a piece of goods to be bought and sold in the interest of larger dividends for shareholders. Neither is he a part of a mechanism planned in accordance with theories taken from the books of a doctrinaire.

The Church should welcome all social change that makes each man and woman more able to use efficiently and joyously the powers which the Creator has given to him or her, to be less of a portion of a machine and more of a personality, while the Church should teach at the same time that only in dependence on God is independence possible. In this light she should judge proposals for social reconstruction.

With the higher politics of noble citizenship and of human civilization, religion ought to have everything to do, to sustain the spirit of disinterestedness, of justice, of fraternity, of service, which so easily flag and sink beneath the dead weight of the inertia and selfishness of the world.

But as to purely party questions which divide on one side and on the other equally good men and also equally bad men, experience will be likely to justify the truth of the saying which comes to us from a shrewd observer of the mistakes of the Puritans of the Commonwealth: "Religion is a good thing, and Politics is a good thing, but they make a fractious mixture."

But such a social principle as that of the right of each person to make the best of himself or herself, the right of equality of opportunity, is no mere party question. It lies at the basis of all social reconstruction. It is at once foundation and aim. But to make the best of ourselves is not possible, unless in collective life—in the service of our fellows.

Simple as this principle is, its application will carry with it ultimately a new orientation, a revolutionary or evolutionary change all the more drastic because involving not merely circumstances, but mentality—a mentality in which the exploiting instinct is as restrained or expurgated as it is now

unchecked, and the instinct for service is as strong as it is now weak.

This ought not to need to mean the elimination of the red corpuscles out of the spirit of man. Christianity is not Buddhism. Anger may be the devil's weapon, but it is also God's sword. "Anger and zeal, and the joy of the brave," can be turned in a new direction—the direction of common good.

"Live dangerously" was Christ's motto as well as Nietzsche's. The soldier instinct, for instance, which, rightly used, is one of the most splendid in our nature, can be, and ought to be, sublimated and turned in some nobler direction than the work of slaughtering our fellows.

A morally justifiable equivalent for war which shall not destroy the combative instincts, but only purge out the Cain-like fratricidal element in their exercise, is one of the most necessary means of discipline, if war is to be abolished, for worse even than war is "the ghastly smooth life, dead at heart."

The Cross will always be necessary. There is no such thing, as Dean Inge has rightly reminded us, as automatic progress, least of all automatic moral progress.

No enchanter's wand can call forth a social Utopia from the potentialities of a humanity undisciplined, unchastened, and unpurged. *Metanoia*—repentance, that is, change of mind and heart—is eternally necessary for nations as for men. "The unlit lamp and the ungirt loins" are the marks of those who have not learnt or who have forgotten the truth that only through obedience and discipline can come freedom and power.

While the cause of Labour is, as I believe, the cause of the Workman of Nazareth, yet this is so only when that cause includes and is inspired by the moral element, and when it extends the spirit of fraternity to the life of the Community as a whole. "Labour" must mean more, something wider and less sectional, than manual industry alone. The best Labour leaders in this country are certainly recognizing this more than they have done before. Without this recognition, a movement of social redemption degenerates into a class war, the sordid dominates, and the ethical departs.

That Will of God which is to be done on earth as it is in Heaven, and which His Church is to strive to get done, is not pledged to secure for all a measure of merely material equality. But it is pledged by its very nature as the expression of unerring Justice and of impartial Love to be on the side of the ignorant and the weak, of the exploited as against those who suck out of their brothers' lives "no small advantage."

The silence of God's Church in the past in regard to these questions has not been without its guilt. "Woe to the shepherds who feed themselves and not the flock" is God's message to all leaders, secular and religious alike, who fail to realize that office and authority mean opportunity for service. "Ye, my people, the flock of my pasture, are men, and I am your God, saith the Lord God." "I have compassion on the multitude."

If some of us now fear the injustice of a possible vindictive movement of the poor against those till lately rich, or at least comfortably placed, we may ask ourselves, Have we, as a Church, realized the force of the attitude of Christ towards avarice, and towards the erection of a money standard as the test of social consideration? If we blame Rome and the East for superstition, what about our own worse sin of the making respectability into a sort of queen of the solid English virtues and patron saint of our own type of Christianity, a type, in accordance with which, as has been wittily said, Mrs. Grundy was raised to the rank of Queen of Heaven *vice* Our Lady deposed? If the people do not always treat us to-day with the full confidence which we long that they should, have we not ourselves in the past been to blame? Have we in the past looked with sealed eyes upon those warnings of the ancient Scriptures which teach us that the cause of the weak and of the disinherited is the cause of God? Are our eyes, even in the present, fully open to the consequences of God's declaration that "He forgetteth not the complaint of the poor"? Do we remember the Master's warning against the "tithing of mint and anise and cummin," and passing over "judgment and the love of God"? Some of the writers of letters to the *Church Times* about minute ritual offences might ponder with profit the above saying of Christ.

We are keen, and rightly keen, to restore the sacramental life to its true position. But have we realized that the essence of the Sacraments is the life of fellowship and love? At this world crisis are we presenting to the disillusioned, unloving, embittered minds of men the supremacy of Christ's Law of Forgiveness—"Reconciliation, word over all, beautiful as the sky"? To have the "mind of Christ" in these, as in all other matters, is the condition of reaching effectively the hearts and intelligences of all "men of goodwill." It is the indispensable condition of speaking with authority and with power.

CHARLES E. OSBORNE.

MISCELLANEA

IN THE STUDY

By Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, B.D., Edit. Sec. of S.P.C.K.

STUDIES IN TEXTS

The *Church Quarterly Review* for July, 1922, contained an interesting article by the Rev. W. Lockton, on "The Origin of the Gospels," in which it is maintained that the Synoptic Gospels were written in this order—St. Luke, St. Mark, St. Matthew. The author makes the remarkable statement that it is very difficult to find any book which makes even the slightest attempt to prove the priority of Mark. But large works like Loisy's *Evangiles Synoptiques* and Professor Cadbury's recent volumes are almost entirely devoted to this subject, and they discuss at great length the alterations made by Matthew and Luke in the Markan tradition and the probable reasons for them. Certainly an author who brought a publisher a MS. working out the subject in detail would meet with an unsympathetic reception, simply on the ground that it had all been done before. Lest the unwary should think that the current opinion is going by default, we give here a specimen of Synoptic criticism. The passage was chosen at random. If the reader finds the exegesis convincing, let him realize that the proof is cumulative. Similar demonstrations could be given from nearly every section of Mark. Mr. Lockton's arguments are misleading. He does not attempt a judicial examination of the problem, but in the spirit of an advocate makes out a plausible case from selected evidence. To refute him in detail would, however, take up more space than we can spare. The passage we choose is Mark ii. 13-15 with its parallels. Each is translated literally from Souter's text.

Mark ii. 13-15: "And He went out again to the sea; and all the crowd was coming to Him, and He was teaching them. And as He passed on His way He saw Levi the son of Alphæus sitting at the receipt of custom, and He says to him, Be My follower (1), and he arose and became His follower (2). And it came to pass that he sat at meat in his house (3), and many publicans and sinners were sitting at meat with Jesus and His disciples; for they were many and were following Him."

Notes.—(1) Present imperative. (2) Aorist of definite act. (3) Impossible to say whether Jesus was in Levi's house or *vice versa*. But the latter is more probable, for (*a*) no change of subject is required; (*b*) the house of Jesus seems to be meant in ii. 1—He is rumoured to be εἰς οἶκον, "at home." This is more natural than supposing it to be Peter's house. (*c*) "With Jesus and His disciples" is more pointed if Jesus is the host.

Matthew ix. 9, 10: "And Jesus passing on His way thence (1) saw a man, sitting at the receipt of custom, called Matthew (2), and says to him, Be My follower, and he arose and became His follower. And it came to pass that as he (3) sat at meat in the house (4), behold, many publicans and sinners came (5) and sat at meat with Jesus and His disciples."

NOTES.—(1) inserted as a link with the preceding section. (2) The author identifies the man with the apostle Matthew, to be mentioned in x. 3. There he is called "Matthew the publican," "the publican" being a kind of cross-reference to this passage. In Mark iii. 18 he is simply "Matthew." (3) Apart from Mark and Luke there could be no doubt that "he"=Matthew. (4) The house of Jesus, for in iv. 13 He is said to have left Nazareth and settled in Capernaum, and in ix. 1 to have returned to His own city; viii. 20 cannot overturn this conclusion. (5) Perhaps represents "they were following Him" of Mark ii. 15.

Luke v. 27-29: "And after these things He went out and beheld a publican, by name Levi (1), sitting at the receipt of custom, and said to him, Be My follower. And he left all (2) and arose and was following Him. And Levi made a great feast for Him in his house (3); and there was a great crowd (4) of publicans and others (5) who were sitting at meat with them (6)."

NOTES.—(1) Luke, writing for Gentile readers, omits the detail of the father's name. (2) Added, perhaps to show that Levi was typical of the Christian's answer to the call. (3) Luke takes the ambiguous passage of Mark in the opposite way to Matthew. (4) Perhaps suggested by the crowd of Mark ii. 13. (5) "Sinners" in Mark, Matthew is used in the technical sense of the "people of the land," the multitude which knew not the law and were accursed. Luke avoids this phrase, which would be hardly intelligible to his readers. (6) "Them" is vague in this connection, and indeed hardly to be explained except as representing "Jesus and His disciples" in Mark, Matthew.

On the usual theory all is in order, and we can follow the thought-processes of the Evangelists. The ambiguity as to the house, solved by the later writers in different ways, is particularly instructive. On Mr. Lockton's theory we must suppose that Mark turned a clear statement by Luke into a purposely ambiguous one, and introduced for his Roman readers two items of Palestinian interest; then that Matthew, instead of interpreting a doubtful passage of Mark by Luke's clear statement, deliberately transferred the feast to the house of Jesus.

Probably every scholar who has worked at the Synoptic problem for himself has come to consider the priority of Mark (leaving aside Q and a special Lukan source) as axiomatic. Mr. Lockton must work out his thesis far more thoroughly if he expects it to secure serious attention.

NOTE.—The review of *Neglected Galilee* in our last issue was by Professor Nairne. His signature was accidentally omitted.—ED.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER.